

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री प्रशासन अकादमी
Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy of Administration

मसूरी
MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY

104829

अवाप्ति संख्या

Accession No.....

~~4285~~

वर्ग संख्या

Class No...

324.2

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No.....

Con

Ser. 1

CONGRESS PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

FROM THE FOUNDATION TO THE SILVER JUBILEE

CONTAINING

**Full text of the Presidential Addresses
from 1885 to 1910.**

FIRST SERIES

Price Rs. Four

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

Years ago the Publishers issued two editions of a collection of Congress Presidential Addresses and the present is an attempt to bring the book up-to-date. In response to a growing demand a complete collection of the Addresses from the foundation to the Golden Jubilee, *i.e.*, from 1885 to 1934 is now being issued in two handsome uniform volumes.

This, the First Series, contains the Presidential Addresses from the first Congress at Bombay to the 25th Session at Allahabad,—from the foundation to the Silver Jubilee of the great movement.

The Second Series contains the text of the Addresses from the Silver to the Golden Jubilee of the institution, *i.e.*, from 1911 to 1934.

As these volumes containing a record of the political activities of India for over half a century are likely to serve as valuable books of reference, advantage has been taken of the issue of this Edition to supply a separate Index for each of them.

It is hoped that this authentic record of the Congress in two volumes will be welcomed not only by students of Indian politics but also by all those interested in obtaining a clear and authoritative account of the origin and growth of Indian nationalism and the evolution of Indian polity.

MADRAS,
June 1935.

}

THE PUBLISHERS.

CONTENTS,

CONGRESS PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

FIRST SERIES

	PAGE
Hon. Mr. W. C. Bonnerji, Bombay—1885	1
Hon. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Calcutta—1886	5
Hon. Mr. Budruddin Tyabji, Madras—1887	21
Mr. George Yule, Allahabad—1888	32
Sir William Wedderburn, Bombay—1889	48
Mr. Pherozechah Mehta, Calcutta—1890	59
Mr. P. Ananda Charlu, Nagpore—1891	80
Mr. W. C. Bonnerji, Allahabad—1892	96
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., Lahore—1893	120
Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., Madras—1894	160
Hon. Mr. Surendranath Banerjea, Poona—1895	179
Hon. Mr. R. M. Sayani, Calcutta—1896	256
Hon. Mr. C. Sankaran Nair, Amraoti—1897	318
Mr. A. M. Bose, Madras—1898	339
Mr. R. C. Dutt, C.I.E., Lucknow—1899	390
Mr. N. G. Chandavarkar, Lahore—1900	424
Mr. D. E. Wacha, Calcutta—1901	448
Mr. Surendranath Banerjee, Ahmedabad—1902	532
Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose, Madras—1903	620
Sir Henry Cotton, Bombay—1904	660
Hon. Mr. G. K. Gokhale, C.I.E., Benares—1905	685
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Calcutta—1906	717
Hon. Dr. Rash Behari Ghose, C.I.E., Surat—1907	745
Hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Lahore—1909	796
Sir William Wedderburn, Allahabad—1910	859

UNIFORM WITH THIS VOLUME

CONGRESS PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

SECOND SERIES

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Pandit Bishan Narayan Dhar, Calcutta—1911 ...	1
Rao Bahadur R. N. Mudholkar, Bankipore—1912	58
Hon. Nawab Syed Mohammed, Karachi—1913 ...	113
Hon. Babu Bhupendranath Basu, Madras—1914 ...	153
Hon. Sir Satyendra Prasanna Sinha, Bombay—1915	185
Babu Amvica Charan Mazumdar, Lucknow—1916	220
Mrs. Annie Besant, Calcutta—1917 ...	291
Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Delhi—1918 ...	378
Pandit Motilal Nehru, Amritsar—1919 ...	415
Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar, Nagpur—1920 ...	475
Hakim Ajmal Khan, Ahmedabad—1921 ...	531
Deshabandhu's Undelivered Address ...	536
Mr. C. R. Das, Gaya—1922 ...	557
Moulana Mohamed Ali, Cocanada—1923 ...	606
Mahatma Gandhi, Belgaum—1924 ...	732
Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Cawnpore—1925 ...	756
Mr. S. Srinivasa Aiyengar, Gauhati—1926 ...	783
Dr. M. A. Ansari, Madras—1927 ...	823
Pandit Motilal Nehru, Calcutta—1928 ...	853
Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Lahore—1929 ...	884
Sardar Vallabhai Patel, Karachi—1931 ...	903
Babu Rajendra Prasad, Bombay—1934 ...	915

Congress Presidents from 1885 to 1934

Session.	Year.	Place.	President.
1	1885	Bombay	Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee
2	1886	Calcutta	„ Dadabhai Naoroji
3	1887	Madras	„ Budruddin Tyabji
4	1888	Allahabad	„ George Yule
5	1889	Bombay	Sir William Wedderburn
6	1890	Calcutta	Mr. P. M. Mehta
7	1891	Nagpur	„ P. Ananda Charlu
8	1892	Allahabad	„ W. C. Bonnerjee
9	1893	Lahore	„ Dadabhai Naoroji
10	1894	Madras	„ Alfred Webb
11	1895	Poona	„ Surendra Nath Bannerjee
12	1896	Calcutta	„ Rahimatullah Sayani
13	1897	Amraoti	„ C. Sankaran Nair
14	1898	Madras	„ A. M. Bose
15	1899	Lucknow	„ R. C. Dutt
16	1900	Lahore	„ N. G. Chandavarkar
17	1901	Calcutta	„ D. E. Wacha
18	1902	Ahmedabad	„ Surendra Nath Banerjee
19	1903	Madras	„ Lal Mohan Ghose
20	1904	Bombay	Sir Henry Cotton
21	1905	Benares	Mr. G. K. Gokhale
22	1906	Calcutta	„ Dadabhai Naoroji
23	1907	Surat	Dr. Rash Behary Ghose
23	1908	Madras	„ Rash Behary Ghose
24	1909	Lahore	Pundit Madan Mohan Malaviya
25	1910	Allahabad	Sir William Wedderburn
26	1911	Calcutta	Pandit Bishan Narayan Dhar
27	1912	Bankipore	Rao Bahadur R. N. Mudholkar
28	1913	Karachi	Hon. Nawab Syed Mohammed
29	1914	Madras	„ Babu Bhupendranath Basu
30	1915	Bombay	„ Sir Satyendra Prasanna Sinha
31	1916	Lucknow	„ Ambika Charan Mazumdar
32	1917	Calcutta	Mrs. Annie Besant
33	1918	Delhi	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya
34	1919	Amritsar	Pandit Motilal Nehru
35	1920	Nagpur	Sit. C. Vijayaraghavachariar
36	1921	Ahmedabad	Hakim Ajmal Khan
37	1922	Gaya	Deshabandhu Das
38	1923	Cocanada	Moulana Mohamed Ali
39	1924	Belgaum	Mahatma Gandhi
40	1925	Cawnpore	Mrs. Sarojini Naidu
41	1926	Gauhati	Mr. S. Srinivasa Aiyengar
42	1927	Madras	Dr. M. A. Ansari
43	1928	Calcutta	Pandit Motilal Nehru
44	1929	Lahore	Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru
45	1931	Karachi	Sardar Vallabhai Patel
48	1924	Bombay	Babu Rajendra Prasad

I have perused a great portion of the Congress literature as published in a handy volume by the enterprising publisher, Mr. Natesan; and to those who desire honestly to know the aims and aspirations of the educated men of India, I can honestly recommend a perusal of this valuable publication.

R. C. DUTT.

CONGRESS PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

First Congress—Bombay—1885

THE HON'BLE MR. W. C. BONNERJI

THE President-elect, in rising to acknowledge the honour done him, said he might well be proud of being thus called on to preside over the first National Assembly ever yet convened in India. Looking round he saw the representatives of all the important centres of the Bombay Presidency : Karachi, Ahmedabad, Surat, Poona, Bombay itself and other less populous, though still important, towns ; almost every district in the Madras Presidency was represented, as well as the towns of Madras, Salem, Coimbatore and others. Of Bengal, his friends and himself might to a certain extent be accepted as representatives since although, owing to a series of misfortunes, deaths, illnesses and the like, of which the meeting were already aware, Bengal was very inadequately represented so far as the members actually present were concerned, though as the delegated exponents of educated native thought in Bengal, they might claim a consideration to which their numerical strength would hardly entitle them. Then, there were the representatives of Lahore, Lucknow, Agra, Allahabad, Benares, each representing Political Associations collectively of very widespread influence. Besides these representatives, who would take an actual part in the proceedings, he rejoiced to see present, as it were as *amicus curiae*, several of the most distinguished native officials of this country, whose presence would materially enhance the weight and the dignity of the proceedings. It was not merely provinces that were

represented, almost all the Political Associations in the Empire were represented by one or more of the gentlemen present, while as regards the press, the proprietors, editors or delegates of the *Mirror*, the *Hindu*, the *Indian Spectator*, the *Tribune*, and others showed conclusively the universality of the feelings which had culminated in the great and memorable gathering. Surely never had so important and comprehensive an assemblage occurred within historical times on the soil of India. He claimed for it an entirely representative character. It was true that, judged from the standard of the House of Commons, they were not representatives of the people of India in the sense the members of the House were representatives of the constituencies. But if community of sentiments, community of feelings and community of wants enabled any one to speak on behalf of others, then assuredly they might justly claim to be the representatives of the people of India. It might be said that they were self-elected, but that was not so. The news that this Congress would be held had been known throughout the year in the different Provinces of India, and they all knew that everywhere the news had been received with great satisfaction by the people at large, and though no formal elections had been held, the representatives had been selected by all the different associations and bodies, and he only wished that all thus selected had been able to attend, instead of their having now to lament the absence of many valued co-adjutors, whose attendance had been unhappily barred by various unfortunate circumstances.

AIMS AND OBJECTS OF THE CONGRESS

And now it seemed a fitting occasion for answering a question that had continually been asked in the world outside during the past few weeks, *viz*, what the objects and aims of this great National Congress really were. He would not pretend to reply to this question exhaustively. The ensuing proceedings would, he believed, do this more effectively than any single speaker could hope to do; but he might say briefly, that the objects of the Congress could for the most part be classed under the following heads:—

- (a) The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the more earnest workers in our country's cause in the different parts of the Empire.
- (b) The eradication, by direct friendly personal intercourse, of all possible race, creed, or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of our country, and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in their beloved Lord Ripon's ever memorable reign.
- (c) The authoritative record, after this has been carefully elicited, by the fullest discussion of the matured opinions of the educated classes in India on some of the more important and pressing of the social questions of the day.
- (d) The determination of the lines upon, and methods by which, during the next twelve months, it is desirable for native politicians to labour in the public interests.

Surely there was nothing in these objects to which any sensible and unprejudiced man could possibly take exception, and yet on more than one occasion remarks had been made by gentlemen, who should have been wiser, condemning the proposed Congress as if it were a nest of conspirators and disloyalists. Let him say once 'for all, and in this he knew well after the long informal discussion that they had all amongst themselves on the previous day, that he was only expressing the sentiments of every gentleman present, that there were no more thoroughly loyal and consistent well-wishers of the British Government than were himself and the friends around him. In meeting to discuss in an orderly and peaceable manner questions of vital importance affecting their well-being, they were following the only course by which the Constitution of England enabled them to represent their views to the ruling authority. Much had been done by Great Britain for the benefit of India, and the whole country was truly grateful to her for it. She had given them order, she had given them railways, and, above all, she had given them the inestimable blessing of Western education. But a great deal still remained to be done. The more progress the people made in education and material prosperity, the greater would be the insight into political matters and the

keener their desire for political advancement. He thought that their desire to be governed according to the ideas of government prevalent in Europe was in no way incompatible with their thorough loyalty to the British Government. All that they desired was, that the basis of the Government should be widened and that the people should have their proper and legitimate share in it. The discussion that would take place in this Congress would, he believed, be as advantageous to the ruling authorities as, he was sure, it would be to the people at large.

Second Congress—Calcutta—1886

THE HON. MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI

I need not tell you how sincerely thankful I am to you for placing me in this position of honour. I at first thought that I was to be elevated to this proud position as a return for what might be considered as a compliment paid by us to Bengal, when Mr. Bonnerji was elected President of the first Congress last year at Bombay. I can assure you, however, that that election was no mere compliment to Bengal, but arose out of the simple fact that we regarded Mr. Bonnerji as a gentleman eminently qualified to take the place of President, and we installed him in that position, in all sincerity, as the proper man in the proper place. I now see, however, that this election of my humble self is not intended as a return of compliment, but that, as both proposer and seconder have said, you have been kind enough to select me, because I am supposed to be really qualified to undertake the task. I hope it may prove so and that I may be found really worthy of all the kind things said of me; but whether this be so, or not, when such kind things are said by those who occupy such high positions amongst us, I must say I feel exceedingly proud and am very grateful to all for the honour thus done me. (*Loud cheering.*)

Your late Chairman has heartily welcomed all the delegates who come from different parts of India, and with the same heartiness I return to him and all our Bengal friends, on my own behalf and on that of all the delegates from other Provinces, the most sincere thanks for the cordial manner in which we have been received. From what has been done already, and from what is in store for

us during our short stay here, I have no doubt we shall carry away with us many and most pleasant reminiscences of our visit to Calcutta. (*Cheers.*)

You will pardon me, and I beg your indulgence when I say that when I was asked only two days ago to become your President and to give an inaugural address, it was with no small trepidation that I agreed to undertake the task; and I hope that you will extend to me all that indulgence which my shortcomings may need. (*Loud cheers.*)

IMPORTANCE OF THE CONGRESS

The assemblage of such a Congress is an event of the utmost importance in Indian history. I ask whether in the most glorious days of Hindu rule, in the days of Rajahs like the great Vikram, you could imagine the possibility of a meeting of this kind, whether even Hindus of all different provinces of the kingdom could have collected and spoken as one nation. Coming down to the later Empire of our friends, the Mahomedans, who probably ruled over a large territory at one time than any Hindu monarch, would it have been, even in the days of the great Akbar himself, possible for a meeting like this to assemble composed of all classes and communities, all speaking one language and all having uniform and high aspirations of their own.

ADVANTAGES OF BRITISH RULE

Well, then, what is it for which we are now met on this occasion? We have assembled to consider questions upon which depend our future, whether glorious or inglorious. It is our good fortune that we are under a rule which makes it possible for us to meet in this manner. (*Cheers.*) It is under the civilizing rule of the Queen and people of England that we meet here together, hindered by none, and are freely allowed to speak our minds without the least fear and without the least hesitation. Such a thing is possible under British rule and British rule only. (*Loud cheers.*) Then I put the question plainly: Is this Congress a nursery for sedition and rebellion against

the British Government (*cries of "No, no"*); or, is it another stone in the foundation of the stability of that Government? (*Cries of "Yes, yes"*.) There could be but one answer, and that you have already given, because we are thoroughly sensible of the numberless blessings conferred upon us, of which the very existence of this Congress is a proof in a nutshell. (*Cheers.*) Were it not for these blessings of British rule, I could not have come here, as I have done, without the least hesitation and without the least fear that my children might be robbed and killed in my absence; nor could you have come from every corner of the land, having performed within a few days journeys which in former days would have occupied as many months. (*Cheers.*) These simple facts bring home to all of us at once some of those great and numberless blessings which British Rule has conferred upon us. But there remain even greater blessings for which we have to be grateful. It is to British rule that we owe the education we possess; the people of England were sincere in the declarations made more than half a century ago that India was a sacred charge entrusted to their care by Providence, and that they were bound to administer it for the good of India, to the glory of their own name, and the satisfaction of God. (*Prolonged cheering.*) When we have to acknowledge so many blessings as flowing from British rule—and I could descant on them for hours, because it would simply be recounting to you the history of the British Empire in India—is it possible that an assembly like this, every one of whose members is fully impressed with the knowledge of these blessings, could meet for any purpose inimical to that rule to which we owe so much? (*Cheers.*)

RELATION BETWEEN OURSELVES AND OUR RULERS

The thing is absurd. Let us speak out like men and proclaim that we are loyal to the backbone (*cheers*); that we understand these benefits English rule has conferred upon us; that we thoroughly appreciate the education that has been given to us, the new light which has been poured upon us, turning us from darkness into light and teaching

us the new lesson that kings are made for the people, not people for their kings ; and this new lesson we have learned amidst the darkness of Asiatic despotism only by the light of free English civilisation. (*Loud cheers*) But the question is, do the Government believe us ? Do they believe that we are really loyal to them ; that we do truly appreciate and rely on British rule ; that we veritably desire its permanent continuance ; that our reason is satisfied and our sentimental feelings gratified as well as our self-interest ? It would be a great gratification to us if we could see, in the inauguration of a great movement like this Congress, that what we do really mean and desire is thoroughly and truly so understood by our rulers. I have the good fortune to be able to place before you testimony which cannot be questioned, from which you will see that some at least of the most distinguished of our rulers do believe that what we say is sincere ; and that we do not want to subvert British rule ; that our outspoken utterances are as much for their good as for our good. They do believe as Lord Ripon said, that what is good for India is good for England. I will give you first the testimony as regards the educated classes, which was given 25 years ago by Sir Bartle Frere. He possessed an intimate knowledge of the people of this country, and with regard to the educated portion of them, he gave this testimony. He said :

And now wherever I go I find the best exponents of the policy of the English Government, and the most able co-adjutors in adjusting that policy to the peculiarities of the natives of India among the ranks of the educated natives.

This much at least is testimony to our sincerity, and strongly corroborates our assertion that we, the educated classes, have become the true interpreters and mediators between the masses of our countrymen and our rulers. I shall now place before you the declaration of the Government of India itself, that they have confidence in the loyalty of the whole people, and do appreciate the sentiments of the educated classes in particular. I will read their very words. They say in a despatch addressed to the Secretary of State (8th June, 1880):

But the people of India accept British rule without any need for appeal to arms, because we keep the peace and do justice, because we have done and are doing much material good to the country and the people, and because there is not inside or outside India any power that can adequately occupy our place.

Then they distinctly understand that we do believe the British power to be the only power that can, under existing circumstances, really keep the peace and advance our future progress. This is testimony as to the feeling of the whole people. But of the educated classes, this despatch says :

To the minds of at least the educated among the people of India—and the number is rapidly increasing—any idea of the subversion of British power is abhorrent from the consciousness that it must result in the wildest anarchy and confusion. (*Loud cheers.*)

We can, therefore, proceed with the utmost serenity and with every confidence that our rulers do understand us; that they do understand our motives and give credit to our expressions of loyalty, and we need not in the least care for any impeachment of disloyalty or any charge of harbouring wild ideas of subverting the British power that may be put forth by ignorant, irresponsible or ill-disposed individuals or cliques. (*Loud cheers.*) We can, therefore, quietly, calmly and, with entire confidence in our rulers, speak as freely as we please, but of course in that spirit of fairness and moderation which becomes wise and honest men, and in the tone which every gentleman, every reasonable being, would adopt when urging his rulers to make him some concession. (*Hear, hear.*) Now although, as I have said, the British Government have done much, very much for us, there is still a great deal more to be done if their noble work is to be fitly completed. They say this themselves; they show a desire to do what more may be required, and it is for us to ask for whatsoever, after due deliberation, we think that we ought to have. (*Cheers.*)

THE JUBILEE OF OUR QUEEN-EMPRESS

Therefore, having said thus much and having cleared the ground so that we may proceed freely and in all

confidence with the work of our Congress, I must at once come to the matter with which I should have commenced, had I not purposely postponed it until I had explained the relations between ourselves and our rulers; and that is the most happy and auspicious occasion which the coming year is to bring us, *viz.*, the Jubilee of our good Queen-Empress's reign. (*Loud cheers.*) I am exceedingly glad that the Congress has thought it right to select this as the subject of the initial resolution, and in this, to express in humble but hearty terms their congratulations to our Gracious Empress. (*Cheers.*) There is even more reason for us to congratulate ourselves on having for half a century enjoyed the rule of a Sovereign, graced with every virtue, and truly worthy to reign over that vast Empire on which the sun never sets. (*Loud cheers.*) That she may live long, honoured and beloved, to continue for yet many years that beneficial and enlightened rule with which she has so long reigned, must be the heartfelt prayer of every soul in India. (*Prolonged cheering.*)

And here you must pardon me if I digress a moment from those subjects, which this Congress proposes to discuss, to one of those which we do not consider to fall within the legitimate sphere of its deliberations.

CONGRESS AND SOCIAL REFORM

It has been asserted that this Congress ought to take up questions of social reform (*cheers and cries of "Yes, yes"*) and our failure to do this has been urged as a reproach against us. Certainly no member of this National Congress is more alive to the necessity of social reform than I am; but, Gentlemen, for everything there are proper times, proper circumstances, proper parties and proper places (*cheers*); we are met together as a political body to represent to our rulers our political aspirations, not to discuss social reforms, and if you blame us for ignoring these, you should equally blame the House of Commons for not discussing the abstruser problems on mathematics or metaphysics. But, besides this, there are here Hindus of every caste, amongst whom, even in the same province,

customs and social arrangements differ widely—there are Mahomedans and Christians of various denominations, Parsis, Sikhs, Brahmos and what not—men indeed of each and all of those numerous classes which constitute in the aggregate the people of India. (*Loud cheers*) How can this gathering of *all* classes discuss the social reforms needed in each individual class? What do any of us know of the internal home life, of the customs, traditions, feelings, prejudices of any class but our own? How could a gathering, a cosmopolitan gathering like this, discuss to any purpose the reforms needed in any one class? Only the members of that class can effectively deal with the reforms therein needed. A National Congress must confine itself to questions in which the entire nation has a direct participation, and it must leave the adjustment of social reforms and other class questions to Class Congresses. But it does not follow that, because this national, political body does not presume to discuss social reforms, the delegates here present are not just as deeply, nay in many cases far more deeply, interested in these questions than in those political questions we do discuss, or that those several communities, whom those delegates represent, are not doing their utmost to solve those complicated problems on which hinge the practical introduction of those reforms. Any man who has eyes and ears open must know what struggles towards higher and better things are going on in every community; and it could not be otherwise with the noble education we are receiving. Once you begin to think about your own actions, your duties and responsibilities to yourself, your neighbours and your nation, you cannot avoid looking round and observing much that is wrong amongst you; and we know, as a fact, that each community is now doing its best according to its lights, and the progress that it has made in education. I need not, I think, particularise. The Mahomedans know what is being done by persons of their community to push on the education their brethren so much need; the Hindus are everywhere doing what they *can* to reform those social institutions which they think require improvement. There is not one single community here represented of which the best and ablest men do not

feel that much has to be done to improve the social, moral, religious status of their brethren, and in which, as a fact, they are not striving to effect gradually those needful improvements; but these are essentially matters too delicate for a stranger's handling—matters which must be left to the guidance of those who alone fully understand them in all their bearings, and which are wholly unsuited to discussion in an assemblage like this in which all classes are intermingled. (*Loud cheers.*)

TRUST IN ENGLAND

I shall now refer briefly to the work of the former Congress. Since it met last year about this time some progress, I am glad to say, has been made, and that is an encouragement and a proof that, if we do really ask what is right and reasonable, we may be sure that sooner or later the British Government will actually give what we ask for. We should therefore persevere, having confidence in the conscience of England and resting assured that the English nation will grudge no sacrifice to prove the sincerity of their desire to do whatever is just and right. (*Cheers.*)

ROYAL COMMISSION

Our first request at the last Congress was for the constitution of a Royal Commission. Unfortunately, the authorities in England have not seen their way to grant a Royal Commission. They say it will upset the authorities here; that it will interfere with the prestige and control of the Government here. I think that this is a very poor compliment to our rulers on this side. If I understand a man like Lord Dufferin of such vast experience in administration, knowing, as he does, what it is to rule an Empire, it would be impossible for him to be daunted and frightened by a Commission making enquiries here. I think this argument a very poor one, and we must once more say that to the inhabitants of India, a Parliamentary Committee taking evidence in England alone can never be satisfactory for the simple reason that what the Committee will learn by the ear will never enable them to understand

what they ought to see with their eyes, if they are to realise what the evidence of the witnesses really means. Still, however, it is so far satisfactory that, notwithstanding the change of Government and the vicissitudes which this poor Parliamentary Committee has undergone, it is the intention of Parliament that under any and all circumstances a Committee shall be appointed. At the same time, this Committee *in future* ties the hands of the authorities here to a large extent and prevents us from saying all we do really want.

COUNCILS FOR N. W. PROVINCES AND THE PUNJAB

Another Resolution, on which we must report some progress, was to the effect that the N. W. Provinces and the Punjab ought also to have Legislative Councils of their own. We know that the Government has just given a Legislative Council to the N. W. Provinces, and we hope that this progress may extend further and satisfy our wishes as to other Provinces also.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

The fourth Resolution had regard to the Service question. In this matter, we really seem to have made some distinct progress. The Public Service Commission is now sitting, and if one thing more than another can prove that the Government is sincere in its desire to do something for us, the appointment of such a Commission is that thing. You perhaps remember the words which our noble Viceroy used at Poona. He said :

However, I will say that, from first to last, I have been a strong advocate for the appointment of a Committee or Commission of this sort, and that when succeeding Governments in England changed, I have on each occasion warmly impressed upon the Secretary of State the necessity of persevering in the nomination of a Commission. I am happy to think that, in response to my earnest representations on the subject, Her Majesty's present ministers have determined to take action. I consequently do not really see what more during the short period I have been amongst you, the Government of India could have done for that most important and burning question, which was perpetually agitating your mind and was being put forward by the natives, as an alleged injustice done to the educated native classes of this country in

not allowing them adequate employment in the Public Service. I do not think you can point out to me any other question which so occupied public attention or was nearer to the hearts of your people. Now the door to inquiry has been opened, and it only remains for you, by the force of logic of your representations and of the evidence you may be able to submit, to make good your case; if you succeed in doing so, all I can say is that nobody will be better pleased than myself. In regard to other matters, which have been equally prominent in your newspapers and your addresses, and which have been so constantly discussed by your associations, I have also done my best to secure for you an ample investigation.

LORD DUFFERIN AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

There we have his own words as to his intentions and the efforts he made to get this Commission. This should convince us of his good faith and sympathy with us. When I think of Lord Dufferin, not only as our present Viceroy, but bearing in mind all we know of him in his past career, I should hesitate to believe that he could be a man devoid of the deepest sympathy with any people struggling to advance and improve their political condition. Some of you may remember one or two extracts, which I gave in my Holborn Town Hall speech from Lord Dufferin's letters to the *Times*, and I cannot conceive that a person of such warm sympathies could fail to sympathise with us. But I may say this much, that feeling, as I naturally do, some interest about the views and intentions of our Viceroys and Governors, I have had the opportunity of getting some information from friends on whom I can rely and who are in a position to know the truth; and I am able to say in the words of one of these friends that

the Viceroy's instincts are eminently liberal, and he regards with neither jealousy nor alarm the desire of the educated classes to be allowed a larger share in the administration of their own affairs. Indeed, he considers it very creditable to them that they should do so.

As Viceroy, he has to consider all sides of a question from the ruler's point of view, and to act as he thinks safe and proper. But we may be sure that we have his deep and very genuine sympathy, and we may fairly claim and expect much good at his hands.

HOME AUTHORITIES AND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

But yet further I would enquire whether the intentions of the Secretary of State for India, and of the other Home authorities, are equally favourable to our claims. The Resolution on its very face tells us what the intention of the Secretary of State is. It says :

In regard to its object, the Commission would, broadly speaking, be required to devise a scheme which may reasonably be hoped to possess the necessary elements of finality, and to do full justice to the claims of natives of India to a higher and more extensive employment in the Public Service.

There we have the highest authority making a declaration that he desires to do full justice to the claims of the natives of India. Now, our only reply is that we are thankful for the enquiry, and we hope that we may be able to satisfy all, that what we ask is both reasonable and right.

INTENTION OF OUR RULERS

As another proof of the intentions of our British rulers, as far back as 53 years ago, when the natives of India did not themselves fully understand their rights, the statesmen of England, of their own free will, decided what the policy of England ought to be towards India. Long and important was the debate ; the question was discussed from all points of view ; the danger of giving political power to the people, the insufficiency of their capacity and other considerations were all fully weighed, and the conclusion was come to, in unmistakable and unambiguous terms, that the policy of British rule should be a policy of justice (*cheers*), the policy of the advancement of one-sixth of the human race (*cheers*) ; India was to be regarded as a trust placed by God in their hands, and in the due discharge of that trust, they resolved that they would follow the ' plain path of duty,' as Mr. Macaulay called it ; on that occasion he said virtually that he would rather see the people of India free and able to govern themselves than that they would remain the bondsmen of Great Britain and the obsequious toadies of British officials.

(Cheers.) This was the essence of the policy of 1833, and in the Act of that year it was laid down :

That no native of the said territories, nor any natural-born subject of His Majesty resident therein shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office or employment under the said Company. (*Prolonged cheering.*)

We do not, we could not, ask for more than this ; and all we have to press upon the Commission and Government is, that they should now honestly grant us in practice here what Great Britain freely conceded to us 50 years ago, when we ourselves were too little enlightened even to ask for it. (*Loud cheers.*)

ROYAL PROCLAMATION

We next passed through a time of trouble, and the British arms were triumphant. When they had completely vanquished all their adversaries, the English nation came forward, animated by the same high and noble resolves, as before, and gave us that glorious Proclamation which we should for ever prize and reverence as our Magna Charta, greater even than the Charter of 1833. I need not repeat that glorious Proclamation now, for it is engraven on all your hearts (*loud cheers*) ; but it constitutes such a grand and glorious charter of our liberties that I think every child, as it begins to gather intelligence and to lispen its mother-tongue, ought to be made to commit it to memory. (*Cheers.*) In that Proclamation, we have again a confirmation of the policy of 1833, and something more. In it are embodied the germs of all that we aim at now, of all that we can desire hereafter. (*Cheers*) We have only to go before the Government and the Commission now sitting and repeat it, and say that all we want is only what has already been granted to us in set terms by that Proclamation, and that all we now ask for is, that the great and generous concessions therein made to us in words shall actually be made ours by deeds. (*Loud cheers.*) I will not, however, enter into further details, for it is a subject on which I should be led into speaking for hours, and even

then I should fail to convey to you an adequate idea of all that is in my heart. I have said enough to show our rulers that our case is complete and has been made out by themselves. (*Cheers.*) It is enough for me, therefore, to stop at this point.

ENLARGEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

Another Resolution is the improvement and enlargement of the Legislative Councils, and the introduction into them of an elective element, but that is one on which my predecessor in the chair has so ably descanted that I do not think I should take up more of your time with it. I need only say that in this matter we hope to make a further advance, and shall try to place before our rulers what we consider a possible scheme for the introduction of an elective element into the Legislative Councils. I need not say that if this representation is introduced, the greatest benefit will be conferred upon the Government itself, because at present whatever Acts they pass that do not quite please us, we, whether rightly or wrongly, grumble and grumble against the Government, and the Government only. It is true that we have some of our own people in Councils. But we have no right to demand any explanation even from them; they are not our representatives, and the Government cannot relieve themselves from any dissatisfaction we may feel against any law we don't like. If our own representatives make a mistake and get a law passed, which we do not want, the Government at any rate will escape the greater portion of the consequent unpopularity. They will say: "Here are your own representatives; we believe that they represented your wishes, and we passed the law." On the other hand, with all the intelligence, all the superior knowledge of the English officials, let them come as angels from heaven, it is impossible for them to enter into the feelings of the people, and feel as they feel, and enter into their minds. (*Cheers.*) It is not any disparagement of them, but in the nature of things it cannot be otherwise. If you have therefore your representatives to represent your feelings, you will then have an opportunity of getting

something which is congenial and satisfactory to yourself; and what will be satisfactory to you must also be satisfactory to and good for the Government itself. (*Cheers.*)

REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT

This brings me also to the point of representation in Parliament. All the most fundamental questions on which hinge the entire form and character of the administration here are decided by Parliament. No matter what it is, Legislative Councils or the Services—nothing can be reformed until Parliament moves and enacts modifications of the existing Acts. Not one single genuine Indian voice is there in Parliament to tell at least what the native view is on any question. This was most forcibly urged upon me by English gentlemen who are in Parliament themselves; they said they always felt it to be a great defect in Parliament, that it did not contain one single genuine representative of the people of India.

POVERTY OF INDIA

One of the questions which will be placed before this Congress and will be discussed by them, is the deep sympathy which this Congress feels for the poverty of the people. It is often understood and thought that, when we struggle for admission into the Services, it is simply to gratify the aspirations of the few educated. But if you examine the question thoroughly, you will find that this matter of the Public Services will go far to settle the problem of the poverty of the Indian people. One thing I congratulate myself upon. I don't trouble you with any testimony about the poverty of India. You have the testimony of Sir Evelyn Baring given only a couple of years ago, who told us in plain terms that the people of India were extremely poor, and also of the present Finance Minister who repeats those words. But amongst the several causes which are at the bottom of our sufferings, this one and that the most important cause is beginning to be realised by our rulers, and that is a step of the most hopeful and promising kind. In the discussion about the currency, the Secretary of State for India, in a letter to the

Treasury of the 26th January 1886, makes certain remarks which show that our rulers now begin to understand and try to grapple with the problem; and are not ostrich-like, shutting their eyes to it. I was laughed at when I first mooted the question of the poverty of India, and assigned as one of its causes the employment of an expensive foreign agency. But now the highest authority emphasizes this view. The Secretary of State, in the letter just referred to, said :

The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of the public revenues is very peculiar, not merely from the habits of the people and their strong aversion to change, which is more specially exhibited towards new forms of taxation, but likewise from the character of the Government, which is in the hands of foreigners, who hold all the principal administrative offices and form so large a part of the Army. The impatience of new taxation which would have to be borne wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country, and virtually to meet additions to charges arising outside of the country, would constitute a political danger, the real magnitude of which, it is to be feared, is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge of, or concern in, the Government of India, but which those responsible for that Government have long regarded as of the most serious order.

We may be sure that the public conscience of England will ask why the natives of India, after a hundred years of British rule, are so poor; and as John Bull, in a cartoon in *Punch* is represented as doing, will wonder that India is a beggar when he thought she had a mint of money.

INDIA'S FABULOUS WEALTH

Unfortunately, this idea of India's wealth is utterly delusive, and if a proper system of representation in the Council be conceded, our representatives will then be able to make clear to these Councils and to our rulers those causes which are operating to undermine our wealth and prosperity, and guide the Government to the proper remedies for the greatest of all evils—the poverty of the masses. All the benefits we have derived from British rule, all the noble projects of our British rulers, will go for nothing if after all the country is to continue sinking deeper and deeper into the abyss of destitution. At one time I was

denounced as a pessimist; but now that we have it on the authority of our rulers themselves that we are *very* poor, it has become the right as well as the duty of this Congress to set forth its convictions both as to this widespread destitution and the primary steps needful for its alleviation. Nothing is more dear to the heart of England—and I speak from actual knowledge—than India's welfare; and if we only speak out loud enough, and persistently enough, to reach that busy heart, we shall not speak in vain. (*Prolonged cheering.*)

CONCLUSION

There will be several other questions brought before the Congress at their Committee meetings during the next three days, and I am sure from the names of the delegates, as far as I am informed, that they will prosecute their deliberations with all possible moderation. I am sure that they will fully appreciate the benefits of the rule under which they live, while the fact that our rulers are willing to do whatever we can show them to be necessary for our welfare, should be enough to encourage all in the work. I do not know that I need now detain you with any further remarks. You have now some idea of what progress has been made in respect of the matters which were discussed last year. I hope we may congratulate ourselves next year that we have made further progress in attaining the objects alike of the past year's resolutions and those we may this year pass. I, for one, am hopeful that if we are only true to ourselves, if we only do justice to ourselves and the noble education which has been given to us by our rulers and speak freely, with the freedom of speech which has been granted to us, we may fairly expect our Government to listen to us and to grant us our reasonable demands. (*Loud cheers.*)

I will conclude this short address by repeating my sincere thanks to all of you for having placed me in this honourable position and by again returning thanks to our Bengal brethren on behalf of all the delegates whom they have so cordially welcomed here.

THE HON. MR. BUDRUDDIN TYABJI

RAJAH Sir T. Madhava Rao and Gentlemen,—I thank you most sincerely for the very great honour you have done me by electing me President of this great national assembly. (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, it is impossible not to feel proud of the great distinction you have thus conferred upon me, the greatest distinction which it is in your power to confer upon any one of your countrymen (*Loud and continued applause*) Gentlemen, I have had the honour of witnessing great public meetings both in Bombay and elsewhere, but it is quite a novel sensation for me to appear before a meeting of this description—a meeting composed not merely of the representatives of any one city or even of one province—but of the whole of the vast Continent of India—representing not any one class or interest, but all classes (*hear, hear and applause*) and all interests of the almost innumerable different communities that constitute the people of India. (*Applause*)

Gentlemen, I had not the good fortune to be present at the proceedings of the first Congress held in Bombay in 1885, nor had I the good fortune to take part in the deliberations of the second Congress held in Calcutta last year. But, Gentlemen, I have carefully read the proceedings of both those Congresses, and I have no hesitation in declaring that they display an amount of talent, wisdom and eloquence of which we have every reason to be proud. (*Applause.*)

A REPRESENTATIVE GATHERING

Gentlemen, from the proceedings of the two past Congresses, I think we are fairly entitled to hope that the proceedings of this present Congress will not only be marked by those virtues, but by that moderation and by that sobriety

of judgment which is the offspring of political wisdom and political experience. (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, all the friends and well-wishers of India, and all those who take an interest in watching over the progress and prosperity of our people, have every reason to rejoice at the increasing success of each succeeding Congress. At the first Congress in Bombay, in 1885, we had less than 100 representatives from the different parts of India; in the second Congress, at Calcutta, in 1886, we had as many as 440 representatives; while at this Congress, I believe, we have over 600 delegates (*applause*) representing all the different parts and all the different communities of this great Empire. I think, then, Gentlemen, that we are fairly entitled to say that this is a truly representative national gathering. (*Hear, hear and applause.*) Indeed if that tentative form of representative institutions, which has so often been asked for from Government, were granted to us, I have not the smallest doubt but that many of the gentlemen I now have the honor of addressing, would be elected by their respective constituencies to represent their interests. (*Applause.*)

CONGRESS AND MUSSULMANS

Gentlemen, it has been urged in derogation of our character, as a representative national gathering, that one great and important community—the Mussulman community—has kept aloof from the proceedings of the two last Congress. Now, Gentlemen, in the first place, this is only partially true and applies only to one particular part of India, and is moreover due to certain special, local, and temporary causes (*hear, hear and applause*), and in the second place, no such reproach can, I think, with any show of justice be urged against this present Congress (*applause*) and, Gentlemen, I must honestly confess to you that one great motive, which has induced me in the present state of my health to undertake the grave responsibilities of presiding over your deliberations, has been an earnest desire on my part to prove, as far as in my power lies, that I, at least not merely in my individual capacity but as representing the Anjuman-i-Islam of Bombay (*loud applause*), do

not consider that there is anything whatever in the position or the relations of the different communities of India—be they Hindus, Mussulmans, Parsis, or Christians—which should induce the leaders of any one community to stand aloof from the others in their efforts to obtain those great general reforms, those great general rights, which are for the common benefit of us all (*hear, hear and applause*) and which, I feel assured, have only to be earnestly and unanimously pressed upon Government to be granted to us.

Gentlemen, it is undoubtedly true that each one of our great Indian communities has its own peculiar social, moral, educational and even political difficulties to surmount—but so far as general political questions affecting the whole of India—such as those which alone are discussed by this Congress—are concerned, I, for one, am utterly at a loss to understand why Mussulmans should not work shoulder to shoulder (*hear, hear and applause*) with their fellow-countrymen, of other races and creeds, for the common benefit of all. (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, this is the principle on which we, in the Bombay Presidency, have always acted, and from the number, the character, the position, and the attainments of Mussulman delegates from the Bengal Presidency and from the Presidency of Madras, as well as from the North-West Provinces and the Punjab, I have not the smallest doubt that this is also the view held, with but few though perhaps important exceptions, by the leaders of the Mussulman communities throughout the whole of India. (*Hear, hear and applause*)

A CONGRESS OF EDUCATED NATIVES

Gentlemen, it has been urged as a slur upon our loyalty that this Congress is composed of what are called the educated natives of India. Now, if by this it is intended to be conveyed that we are merely a crowd of people with nothing but our education to commend us, if it is intended to be conveyed that the gentry, the nobility, and the aristocracy of the land have kept aloof from us, I can only meet that assertion by the most direct and the most absolute denial. (*Hear, hear and applause.*) To any person who made

that assertion, I should feel inclined to say: 'Come with me into this Hall (*applause*) and look around you, (*applause*) and tell me where you could wish to see a better representation of the aristocracy, not only of birth and of wealth, but of intellect, education, and position, than you see gathered within the walls of this Hall.' (*Applause.*) But, Gentlemen, if no such insinuation is intended to be made, I should only say that I am happy to think that this Congress does consist of the educated natives of India. (*Hear, hear.*)

Gentlemen, I, for one, am proud to be called not only educated but a "native" of this country. (*Applause and hear, hear.*) And, Gentlemen, I should like to know where among all the millions of Her Majesty's subjects in India are to be found more truly loyal, nay, more devoted friends of the British Empire than among these educated natives. (*Loud and continued applause.*) Gentlemen, to be a true and sincere friend of the British Government, it is necessary that one should be in a position to appreciate the great blessings which that Government has conferred upon us, and I should like to know who is in a better position to appreciate these blessings—the ignorant peasants or the educated natives? Who, for instance, will better appreciate the advantages of good roads, railways, telegraphs and post offices, schools, colleges and universities, hospitals, good laws and impartial courts of justice?—the educated natives or the ignorant peasants of this country? (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, if there ever were to arise—which God forbid—any great struggle between Russia and Great Britain for supremacy in this country—who is more likely to judge better of the two Empires? (*Hear, hear.*) Again I say, Gentlemen, that in these matters it is the educated natives that are best qualified to judge, because it is we who know and are best able to appreciate, for instance, the blessings of the right of public meeting, the liberty of action and of speech, and high education which we enjoy under Great Britain, whereas probably under Russia we should have nothing but a haughty and despotic Government, whose chief glory would consist in vast military organization,

aggression upon our neighbours, and great military exploits. (*Applause.*)

ARE THE EDUCATED NATIVES DISLOYAL ?

No, Gentlemen, let our opponents say what they please, we the educated natives, by the mere force of our education, must be the best appreciators of the blessings of a civilized and enlightened Government and, therefore, in our own interests, the best and staunchest supporters of the British Government in India. (*Applause.*) But, Gentlemen, do those who thus charge us with disloyalty stop for a moment to consider the full meaning and effect of their argument,—do they realize the full import and significance of the assertion they make ? Do they understand that, in charging us with disloyalty, they are in reality condemning and denouncing the very Government which it is their intention to support. (*Hear, hear, loud and continued applause.*) For, Gentlemen, when they say that the educated natives of India are disloyal, what does it mean ? It means this : that in the opinion of the educated natives—that is to say, of all the men of light and leading, all those who have received a sound, liberal and enlightened education, all those who are acquainted with the history of their own country and with the nature of the present and past Governments, that in the opinion of all these—the English Government is so bad that it has deserved to forfeit the confidence and the loyalty of the thinking part of the population. (*Hear, hear and applause.*) Now, Gentlemen, is it conceivable that a more frightful and unjust condemnation of the British Government can be pronounced than is implied in this charge of disloyalty against the educated natives of India ? Gentlemen, if this charge were brought by some bitter enemies of Great Britain, if it were brought by the Russians, for example, I could understand it. (*Hear, hear.*) But it is almost beyond my comprehension that it should come, not from enemies but from the supposed friends of the British Government (*loud laughter, and hear, hear*), not from the Russians but from Englishmen (*hear, hear*), who presumably want, not to destroy, but to support their Government ? I

say it surpasses my comprehension. (*Loud applause.*) Gentlemen, just consider for a moment the effect of this reckless allegation upon the uneducated millions of the inhabitants of this country, upon the hordes of the Russians in the north, and upon the enlightened nations of Europe ! I say, therefore, that the conduct of those who thus recklessly charge us with disloyalty resembles the conduct of the "foolish woodman", who was lopping off the very branch of the tree upon which he was standing (*hear, hear, loud applause and loud laughter*), unconscious that the destruction of the branch meant the destruction of himself. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Happily, however, Gentlemen, this allegation is as absurd as it is unfounded. It is as unjust to us as it is unjust to the Government it impeaches. But though, Gentlemen, I maintain that the educated natives, as a class, are loyal to the backbone (*hear, hear*), I must yet admit that some of our countrymen are not always guarded, not always cautious, in the language they employ. I must admit that some of them do sometimes afford openings for hostile criticisms, and I must say that I have myself observed in some of the Indian newspapers, and in the speeches of public speakers, sentiments and expressions which are calculated to lead one to the conclusion that they have not fully realised the distinction between licence and liberty ; that they have not wholly grasped the lesson that freedom has its responsibilities no less than its privileges. (*Hear, hear.*) And, therefore, Gentlemen, I trust that not only during the debates of this Congress, but on all occasions, we shall ever bear in mind and ever impress upon our countrymen that, if we are to enjoy the right of public discussion, the liberty of speech and liberty of the Press, we must so conduct ourselves as to demonstrate by our conduct, by our moderation, by the justness of our criticisms, that we fully deserve these—the greatest blessings which an enlightened Government can confer upon its subjects. (*Hear, hear and applause.*)

EUROPEANS AND INDIAN ASPIRATIONS

Gentlemen, it has been sometimes urged that Europeans in this country do not fully sympathise with the just aspirations of the natives of India. In the first place, this is not universally true, because I have the good fortune to know many Europeans than whom truer or more devoted friends of India do not breathe on the face of the earth. (*Hear, hear and applause.*) And in the second place, we must be prepared to make very considerable allowance for our European fellow-subjects, because their position in this country is surrounded by difficult and complicated questions, not merely of a political but of a social character, which tend more or less to keep the two communities asunder in spite of the best efforts of the leaders of European no less than of native society. Gentlemen, so long as our European friends come to this country as merely temporary residents, so long as they come here merely for the purpose of trade, commerce or of a profession, so long as they do not look upon India as a country in whose welfare they are permanently interested, so long it will be impossible for us to expect that the majority of the Europeans should fraternize with us upon all great public questions (*hear, hear*) and it has, therefore, always seemed to me that one of the greatest, the most difficult, the most complicated and, at the same time, one of the most important problems to be solved is, how to make our European friends look upon India as in some sense their own country, even by adoption. For, Gentlemen, if we could but induce our retired merchants, engineers, doctors, solicitors, barristers, judges and civilians to make India permanently their home (*hear, hear and applause*), what an amount of talent and ability, political experience and ripe judgment we should retain in India for the benefit of us all. (*Applause.*) All these great questions in regard to the financial drain on India, and those questions arising from jealousy of races and the rivalry for public employment, would at once disappear. And when we speak of the poverty of India, because of the draining away of vast sums of money from India to England, it has

always seemed to me strange that so little thought should be bestowed upon the question of the poverty of our resources, caused by the drain of so many men of public, political and intellectual eminence from our shores every year. (*Applause.*)

CONGRESS AND SOCIAL REFORM

Now, Gentlemen, one word as to the scope of our action and deliberations. It has been urged—solemnly urged—as an objection against our proceedings—that this Congress does not discuss the question of Social Reform. But, Gentlemen, this matter has already been fully dealt with by my friend, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who presided over your deliberations last year. And I must confess that the objection seems to me strange, seeing that this Congress is composed of the representatives, not of any one class or community, not of one part of India, but of all the different parts, and of all the different classes, and of all the different communities of India. Whereas any question of Social Reform must of necessity affect some particular part or some particular community of India only—and, therefore, Gentlemen, it seems to me, that although we, Mussulmans, have our own social problems to solve, just as our Hindu and Parsi friends have theirs, yet these questions can be best dealt with by the leaders of the particular communities to which they relate. (*Applause.*) I, therefore, think, Gentlemen, that the only wise and, indeed, the only possible course we can adopt is to confine our discussions to such questions as affect the whole of India at large, and to abstain from the discussion of questions that affect a particular part or a particular community only. (*Loud applause.*)

SUBJECTS BEFORE THE CONGRESS

Gentlemen, I do not at present at least propose to say anything upon the various problems that will be submitted to you for your consideration. I have no doubt the questions will be discussed in a manner and in a spirit that will reflect credit upon us all. I will only say this: Be moderate in your demands, be just in your criticism, be accurate in your facts, be logical in your conclusions, and

you may rest assured that any propositions you may make to our rulers will be received with that benign consideration which is the characteristic of a strong and enlightened Government. (*Applause.*) And now, Gentlemen, I fear, I have already trespassed (*voices of "No, no"*) too long upon your time. Before I sit down, I will once more offer to you my thanks from the very bottom of my heart for the very great honour you have done me, and I pray to God that I may be enabled, in some measure at least, to deserve your approbation and justify the choice you have made and the confidence you have reposed in me. (*Loud applause.*) Gentlemen, I wish this Congress and all succeeding Congresses every success and every prosperity. (*Applause.*)

TRIBUTE TO THE DEAD

I am very glad to see the representatives of so many different communities and parts of India gathered together this afternoon before us. This, in itself, Gentlemen, is no small advantage that we, as representatives of the different parts of India, should have the opportunity of meeting and discussing together the various problems that affect us all. (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, I will not take up much more of your time. I say, as our Chairman, Sir T. Madhava Rao, has said; "I welcome you here" but at the same time I cannot help expressing my deep regret, a regret that I know you all share, that on this occasion we are deprived of the aid and counsel of some of those gentlemen, who laboured most earnestly for and who graced with their presence the Congress on previous occasions, and who have now, all too soon for their country's sake, passed from amongst us. Among the friends we have lost are: Dr. Athalye of Bombay and Madras, who took such an energetic part in the first Congress held in Bombay, in the year 1885, and Mr. Girija Bhusar Mookerjee, whom you all know, and whom all who knew loved and respected, and who was one of the most active workers of the Congress held in Calcutta last year. Then, too, we have to mourn the loss of Mr. Dayaram Jethmall, the founder of the National Party in Sind, and a distinguished gentleman.

belonging to this Presidency (though I fear I am not in a position to pronounce his name correctly), Mr. Singaraju Venkata Subbaroyudu of Masulipatam. But, to all these, Gentlemen, of whose assistance and guidance we have been deprived, we must owe a lasting debt of gratitude. They, in their life-time, spared no pains to make the Congress, either in Bombay or Calcutta, a success, as far as in their power lay, and it only remains for us, while cherishing their memories, to emulate their example. (*Loud and continued applause.*)

CONCLUSION

Gentlemen, in addition to those of you, who have been able to come to Madras, we have received numerous letters and telegrams from associations of various kinds, and from a large number of representative men in other parts of India, who for some reason or other have been debarred from being represented at or attending this Congress. We have received telegrams from Hyderabad, from all kinds of places in the Madras Presidency—the names of which I shall not venture to pronounce—from Karachi, Calcutta, Dehra Dun, Sambur, Bangalore, Dacca, from His Highness the Maharaja of Durbungah, Messrs. Lal Mohun and Mano Mohan Ghose, Telang, and a vast number of other places and persons too numerous for me to pretend to recapitulate. There are no less than sixty odd telegrams alone placed before me. But, Gentlemen, there is one among those which I am particularly anxious to bring to your notice, and that is from our old and distinguished friend, Mr. Atkins (*laughter*), whom by name at least I have not the smallest doubt, every one of us here perfectly knows. (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, in his telegram he wishes this Congress and all future Congresses perfect success. (*Applause.*) He wishes that the unity of the different communities should be promoted and that the objects which we all have at heart should be attained. (*Applause.*) I think you will be of opinion that that is a very good omen. We want the assistance not only of representative men of the Indian communities, but we also want the assistance of Europeans. (*Applause.*)

Gentlemen, while we are attempting to learn some few lessons in the art of Self-Government, our European friends have inherited that art from their forefathers after centuries of experience and it cannot be doubted that if we can induce our European friends to co-operate with us in these various political matters, which in point of fact affect them no less than they affect us, it cannot, I say, be doubted that it will conduce to the advantage, not only of ourselves, but of the European community also.

(Loud applause.)

MR. GEORGE YULE

GENTLEMEN,—When I was asked sometime ago to allow myself to be nominated for the position to which you have now elected me, I had some hesitation in giving my assent to the request. It was an unexpected, and with all due deference to the judgment of my too indulgent friends, it was an undeserved compliment. That, however, is a kind of objection which can always and very easily be got over. But I knew your assemblies were very large, and I also know that it is a most desirable quality in the President of such a gathering to have a voice strong enough to reach the remotest listener. I feared I had no such voice. For that reason chiefly, and for others that need not be mentioned, I felt, I hope with unaffected diffidence, that I was scarcely the man to follow those magnificent speakers who had occupied the chair at previous meetings of the Congress. Nevertheless, quickened by my warm sympathies with the main objects of the Congress, I am here at your call for better or for worse. (*Cheers.*)

REFORM OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

And now, Gentlemen, I come at once to the business that lies before us. Why are we here? What do we want? What are we striving after? In the Resolutions that are to be submitted to you, there are some reforms embodied which state our wants, which set forth our views, and indicate the direction in which our thoughts are travelling. I think I am right, however, in saying that all these do not occupy exactly the same place in our regards. About one or two of them there is more or less of doubt as to their value or importance. But there is one of them respecting which there is the most complete and perfect

unanimity of opinion. I refer to the reform of the Legislative Councils. I myself regard this one as the most important of all. Each of the other reforms begins and ends with itself. The reform of the Councils is not only in itself good, but it has the additional virtue of being the best of all instruments for obtaining other reforms that further experience and our growing wants may lead us to desire. (*Loud cheers.*) With your permission I will confine the observations I have to make to this one question.

ORIGIN OF THE INDIA BILL

In doing so, it seems to me to be needful first of all to state some of the facts connected with the origin of the Bill under which the affairs of India are at present administered. When the sole Government of this country was taken over by the Crown in 1858, it fell to the lot of Lord Palmerston, who was then Prime Minister, to introduce into the House of Commons a Bill which was afterwards known as India Bill No. 1. The main provisions of this Bill were, that the Government of India was to vest in a Viceroy and Council in India, and a council of eight retired Indian officials presided over by a Secretary of State in London. The proceedings of these two separate bodies, each of whom had certain independent responsibilities, were to be subject to the review and final decision of the House of Commons. The chief objection to this Bill was, that no provision was made for the representation of the people of the country. Mr. Disraeli, who was leader of the Opposition, objected to it on the ground of the insufficient check which it provided; and he said that with such Councils as those proposed, "you could not be sure that inhabitants of India would be able to obtain that redress from the grievances under which they suffered, that English protection ought to insure." Almost immediately after the introduction of the Bill, Lord Palmerston was defeated upon a side question, and Lord Derby became Prime Minister with Mr. Disraeli as leader of the House of Commons. No time was lost by the new Ministry in introducing India Bill No. 2. Mr. Disraeli dwelt upon the desirability of having the

representative principle applied to the Government of the country, and his scheme was to increase the Council in London, which was proposed by Lord Palmerston, from eight to eighteen Members, half of whom were to be elected and were, in all other respects, to be entirely independent of Government. He regretted that the unsettled state of the country did not admit of a representation of the people in India itself, and all that could be done in the meantime was to approach as near to that form of Government as the circumstances would permit. The provisions of his Bill to effect that purpose were briefly these : Four of the elected half of the Council were to be members of the Indian Civil and Military Services of ten years' standing, and the remaining five must have been engaged in trading with India for at least five years. The constituency electing the four members connected with the services was to consist of all officers of both branches of the India service, and also of all residents in India owning £2,000 of an Indian railway, or £1,000 of Government stock. The five mercantile members were to be elected by the Parliamentary Constituencies of London, Belfast, Liverpool, Manchester and Glasgow. So deeply ingrained is this notion of Government by representation in the minds of Englishmen that, rather than leave it out of sight altogether in dealing with the affairs of India, the Government of that day made the proposals I have stated. Although the intention underlying these proposals was applauded, the scheme itself was felt to be, from the imperfect character of the constituencies, wholly inadequate to secure the check that was desired. It was clear, or rather it soon became clear, that the interests of one set of voters were adverse to the interests of the mass of the people, and that the other set knew absolutely nothing of the country or its wants. Received with favour at first, the Bill soon became the object of jest and derision on the part of the Opposition, and even its more impartial critics said of it that it was useless offering to the people of India, under the name of bread, what would certainly turn out to be a stone. At the suggestion of Lord John Russell, the Bill was withdrawn, and the House proceeded by way of

resolution to construct the framework of another Bill. The plan finally adopted was this: the Legislative and Administrative powers were to be entrusted to a Viceroy and a Council in India, and the check upon them was to be a Council of fifteen Members sitting in London. This Council was to be responsible to the Cabinet through a Secretary of State, who was to be responsible in turn to the House of Commons. This arrangement was regarded merely as a provisional one, and the policy to be pursued was to work up to the constitutional standard. Education was to be largely extended and improved, and the natives of the country were to be drafted into the service of Government, as they became qualified with the view, among other reasons, to fit them for the anticipated enlargement of their political powers (*Hear, hear.*) The promises made and the prospects held out in the debates in Parliament derived a lustre for the famous Proclamation of the Queen—that half fulfilled charter of India's rights—which was first read and published to the people of India in this very city of Allahabad thirty years ago. (*Loud cheers.*)

HOW THE INDIA BILL WORKS

Now, what I wish to impress upon your minds by this brief narrative is the great importance that was attached at that time to some sort of constitutional check. Failing to have it in the form that the English people themselves approved and followed in the management of their own affairs, they devised the substitute with its threefold check that I have mentioned. Parliament itself was full of gushing enthusiasm as to the part it would take in the business. In the absence of a representative body in India, the House of Commons was to pay the role of one on our behalf. It was to regard the work as a great and solemn trust committed to it by an all-wise and inscrutable Providence, the duties of which it would faithfully and fully discharge. Such was the style of language employed both in and out of Parliament at the time I alluded to. And now what is the actual state of the case? It is summed up in a single sentence: *There is no*

check. The Bill under which our affairs are administered appears, like many other Bills, to be open to more than one interpretation. The interpretation put upon it at the time, and what was probably the intention of Parliament, was this: the Government in India was to have the right of initiative; the Council in London the right of review, and the Secretary of State, subject to the ultimate judgment of the House of Commons, the right of veto. And this was practically the relations of the parties until 1870. In that year, the Duke of Argyle was Secretary of State; and in a controversy on this subject with Lord Mayo, who was then Viceroy, he laid down quite another doctrine. He held that the Government in India had no independent power at all, and that the prerogative of the Secretary of State was not limited to a veto of the measures passed in India. "The Government in India," he maintained, "were merely Executive officers of the Home Government, who hold the ultimate power of requiring the Governor-General to produce a measure and of requiring also all the Official Members of the Council to vote for it." This power-absorbing Despatch is dated the 24th November, 1870. The supposed powers and privileges of the Council in London have been similarly dealt with, and the Council is now regarded merely as an adjunct of the Office of the Secretary of State to furnish him with information or advice when he chooses to ask for it. The present position, then, is this: the Government in India has no power; the Council in London has no power; the House of Commons has the power, but it refuses or neglects to exercise it.

WHAT PARLIAMENT DOES

The 650 odd members, who were to be the palladium of India's rights and liberties, have thrown "the great and solemn trust of an inscrutable Providence" back upon the hands of Providence to be looked after as Providence itself thinks best. (*Laughter*) The affairs of India, especially in the Financial Department, have passed with no kind of check whatever into the hands of the Secretary of State. I do not blame the present members of the House of

Commons for thus abdicating the functions that their predecessors of thirty years ago assumed. The truth is, that they have not time enough to attend to the details of the trust ; and on more important matters they can have only one side of every question—the official side—presented to them ; and they know from experience that that is not always the whole of the case. (*Laughter*) As they are not in a position to judge rightly, they do not attempt to judge at all ; and they may fairly come to the conclusion that, if it is not worth our while to demand and agitate for some voice in our own affairs, it is not worth their while to trouble themselves at all about us. If we be satisfied, for example, to have the Budget thrown at our heads like a snow-ball, and a muddy one it is, we deserve to have it in that way. There is a common belief among the European trading community that there are some big leaks in the Store Department and in Home Charges generally ; but we have no means for verifying or disproving the suspicion. Now and again we hear of some facts that confirm it. Here is one told me the other day by an authority I would call unimpeachable. The department with which this gentleman is connected indented for an article, and after many weary months, it came at last charged six times the price for which, my informant said, he himself could have bought it. If we be content with the secrecy and the supposed inefficiency of such a system, then I say we deserve no better. Temporary commissions of enquiry into the working of such departments are of little good. The real remedy is a permanent commission in the shape of elected members of Council having the right to look into such matters. (*Cheers.*)

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS ON A WIDER BASIS

But when we make the demand that the political institutions of the country should be placed on a wider basis, we are not only asking what the Government of thirty years ago avowed was desirable, but also what almost every Viceroy since that time has either promised, or held out as a hope to be indulged in by us. I admit that these promises have been associated with such phrases

as "when qualified" or "as far as may be." These words doubtless afford a pretext for shirking the due fulfilment of the promise. Of course, to the antagonistic mind, our qualification will always be in the future; but I am sure I express your conviction when I say that, whatever use the abettors of the present bureaucratic rule may make of these phrases, the distinguished personages who uttered them had far other intentions than to make of them a loop-hole of escape when all other channels of retreat were closed by a reasonable fulfilment of the conditions. Putting aside then this Small Cause Court use of the words (*laughter*), I come to say something on the question of qualification. What does it mean? What was in the minds of the Queen's advisers when these phrases were employed? Can we doubt that they were thinking of the qualifications of ordinary English constituencies at a somewhat more rudimentary stage of their development than they are to-day? Now, if it can be shown that there are considerable numbers of people in this country with attainments and characteristics similar to those of constituencies in Great Britain two or three generations back, the condition as regards them has surely been amply fulfilled. But how is that to be shown? It is not a matter for mere floating opinion to decide, one man saying Yes, and the next saying No, but neither being able to adduce any reason or state any fact in support of his view. If you want to know the financial resources of a body of men such as a trading company, you audit their accounts. If you wish to ascertain where a village is in point of education, you don't inquire what Mr. This or Baboo That thinks, but you want to know how many schools there are, how many scholars there are, and what amount of money is being spent upon them.

SOME FACTS FROM THE BLUE BOOKS

Then you have facts of a kind on which to form an intelligent and reliable judgment. Now, Gentlemen, in the Blue Books published by the Indian Government, you have the material, the moral and the educational state of

the country set out in such fulness as to enable us to say where the people are, in the scale of humanity, as compared with those of other countries. I am not going into an "as-dry-as-dust" analysis of these facts. I simply indicate the method of proof, and I challenge any one to rise from the study of these books and give reasonable grounds for denying that there are large bodies of men in this country fitted in every way for the proper discharge of duties connected with a constitutional form of government. One or two of the facts may be mentioned, however, to illustrate the nature of this evidence. The total foreign trade of India has reached the figures of £150,000,000 a year, which was the extent of the commerce of the United Kingdom in 1837. We are in precisely the same position as regards commerce that England was fifty years ago, and yet the mercantile community have not an authoritative word to say about the laws and regulations affecting such a prodigious trade. The income of the British Government in 1837 was £47,200,000, not one penny of which was raised or spent without the sanction of the representatives of the people. The Indian Budget of last year shows an income of £77,000,000, and there is not a man in the country outside the Supreme Council who has a vote or a voice in the matter. (*Loud cheers.*) Since 1858, about £20,000,000 have been spent on educational institutions. The number of these institutions at the present time is 122,000 attended by upwards of 3,300,000 students. The number of schools in England in 1821 was only 18,467 and the scholars 650,000. These, however, have rapidly increased during the last twenty years, but it was not till 1881 that they reached the number of the schools and scholars in this country. Now a statesman or a politician would surely be justified in concluding that the country, of which such facts can be stated, must have within it considerable numbers of men of means, intelligence, industry, foresight and moral grit—the very material out of which good representative institutions can be carved. But there are other considerations that add weight to the testimony of the Blue Books.

BRITISH NON-OFFICIAL CLASS ON INDIANS

In all the discussions that have taken place in Parliament about the inhabitants of India, there is one section which has never been thought of at all—I mean the British non-official class to which I belong. I want to make our existence known. We may be known as barristers and solicitors, as bankers, traders, merchants, engineers, editors of newspapers, manufacturers, planters and so forth; but the idea of citizenship, and all that implies never seems to have occurred to our rulers in connection with us. I know it has been said that we are already represented. We are English, and the Government is English; therefore we are represented. But that is a false inference and a pure delusion. We have no more power and no more voice in the government of the country than you Indians have. The Government is no more ours, because it is administered by a Secretary of State, who is an Englishman, than the bread in a baker's shop is ours, because the shop happens to be kept by an Englishman and not by a Native. (*Laughter and cheers.*) We are all alike held to be on the same low level of unfitness and unripeness. The only thing we are the least bit good for in the country, from the Governmental point of view, is to be taxed. (*Cheers.*) We are ripe enough for that; ripe enough to come under the sweep of the Board of Revenue sickle, but unripe for the meanest privileges of subjects of a free country. Our number is uncertain. The census tables do not inform us: but, few or many, almost all of us would be voters in England, and I venture to suggest that we would make a passable fraction of a constituency in this country. There is another consideration. There are many thousands of Hindu, Mahomedan, Eurasian, Parsi and other gentlemen in the country, who, if they were to transfer their persons to England for twelve months or more and pay certain rates, would be qualified to enjoy all the rights and privileges of British subjects. If you and I go to England, we are qualified. If we return to India, our character changes, and we are not qualified. In England, we should be trusted citizens. In

India, well, the charitably-minded among our opponents say that we are incipient traitors! (*Loud and prolonged cheers and laughter.*)

There is one more consideration. You know that the Government is accustomed to send some of the Bills it has in preparation to all our leading associations, both Native and European, for the expression of our opinion upon their provisions. If we be qualified to give an opinion outside the Councils, how much more valuable would that opinion be with the fuller knowledge that can be obtained inside the Council?

THE POSSESSION OF A STAKE

I have thus far spoken of the qualification as having an intellectual as well as a material basis, but I may say here that the only qualification ever known to the British constitution has been the possession of a stake, as it is called, in the country. For four hundred years that stake was a forty-shillings freehold. At the present time, it is the occupancy of a house and the payment of certain rates. An educational qualification may be implied in these later days, but it has never formed a test of fitness within the British dominions. But assuming it to be so, then, what I find is that India to-day, taking it all over, is in rather a better state in this respect than England was a century ago. At least every ninth man in India can read and write. Now, I will read to you a short extract from an excellent little book by Professor Thorold Rogers called the "British Citizen." He says, speaking of England:

I do not believe that 100 years ago more than one man in ten, or one woman in twenty, knew how to read and write. When I was a youth in a Hampshire village, hardly one of the peasantry who was over forty years of age knew how to read. It was deemed superfluous to give even a rudimentary education to the peasant.

Going another century or two back, the people of England, man and boy, high and low, with the exception of a mere handful, were steeped in the grossest ignorance, and yet there was a House of Commons. But whatever may be deemed to be a proper qualification in England, or here, it is part of our own case that the

great majority of the people is quite unfitted for the franchise. There we are at one with our opponents. But then they say that that is a good reason why the minority should wait until the mass be also qualified. There I think they are wrong. Granted that a man is not entitled to a vote any more than he is entitled to drive a steam-engine and that is my own view of this question: but because the persons in a country capable of managing steam-engines are few compared with those who are not, are we, on that account, to debar the capable few from following their vocation? (*Cheers.*) In like manner, I contend that if there be but a small minority in a country fitted to exercise the useful function of the franchise, it is a mistake to withhold the privilege from them on the ground that others are not fitted. Given increasing means and growing intelligence, there invariably follows a desire to have a voice in all matters that concern us; and I hope it is not difficult to believe that such a desire, "the monition of nature," as Carlyle calls it, "and much to be attended to," has been implanted in the human breast for some wise and good purpose. Happy would it be for the world if, instead of thwarting and repressing such a desire, its rulers nourished it and guided it, as it arose, into the proper channels for its due gratification and exercise. (*Cheers*)

NEEDED A CHANGE IN THE POLITY OF THE COUNTRY

Now the views and facts I have submitted would seem to warrant some important change in the polity of the country; but the change we do advocate is one of extreme moderation, and far within the limits that the circumstances of the country, in my own opinion, would justify. We don't seek to begin, as has been asserted, at the point England has reached after many generations of constitutional government. We don't want the strong meat of full age, but we want to be weaned. We say there are numbers of us, who have had the feeding bottle long enough. We desire no sudden snapping of existing ties; we ask only for the loosening of the bonds. We are content to regard ourselves as in the position of the

man, who has long been confined in a darkened room on account of disordered eyesight. We know that, under the skilful treatment of a kindly physician, our visual powers have been strengthened. We have sense enough not to demand the full blaze of day to be suddenly let in upon us, but only such a drawing aside of the curtains as will adjust the light to our powers of vision. But, if the physician, skilful and kindly as we recognise him to be, were to insist upon our remaining in the dark, we should be forced to the unwelcome conclusion that his skill was resultless and abortive, or that the unlovable side of his character had manifested itself in what he wished to keep us in the dark for some unworthy purpose of his own. If under such treatment we become discontented with his services, the blame of it would be with the physician and not with the patient. (*Cheers.*)

WHAT INDIANS REALLY WANT

Now, Gentlemen, I will state more definitely the change we desire. We want the Legislative Council to be expanded to an extent that will admit of the representation of the various interests in the country, as far as that may be practicable. We want half the Councils to be elected, the other half to be in the appointment of Government, and we are willing that the right of veto should be with the Executive. We also want the right of interpellation. These are the substance of our wants. We propose that the constituencies should consist of Members of Municipalities, Chambers of Commerce, Trade Associations; associations like the British Indian Association, and, generally, all persons possessing such qualifications, educational and pecuniary as may be deemed necessary. We should have to go far back in the history of England to find a parallel to the limited privileges we should be content with—to the time, at all events, of Edward the First, 600 years ago, when Barons and Commons sat together, and when King and Barons held the sway. We are not wedded even to these proposals. The principle of election frankly accepted, there would be little difficulty in satisfying us in the matter of the constituencies, or as to the size of Councils.

The devising of a suitable elective body might well be left to the Government, or better still, by way of a preliminary, to the final judgment of the Government, to a small Commission which could easily be rendered acceptable to the whole community. Happily there is no scarcity of men in the country, both among the official and non-official classes, abundantly qualified for such a work. I should like to mention the names of half-a dozen such men chiefly for the purpose of dissipating the fears of those who seem to think we have some revolutionary scheme in view, and not because they only are competent for such an undertaking. If you were willing to commit the working out of the practical details of the reform we ask for to the men I wish to name, we ought to hear the last of the reckless charges that are made against us. The first I have in my mind's eye is that wary, sagacious Scotchman, who has just closed a long and honorable career of worthy service among us, Sir Charles Aitchison. The second is an Englishman no less qualified by experience and by endowment of head and heart for the task, Sir Stuart Bayley. The next is the veteran statesman from the Southern Provinces, Sir Madhava Rao. The next is a Mahomedan of tried legislative ability from the Bombay side of the Peninsula, Budruddin Tyabji. The next is a gentleman from Bengal, whose character and talents have placed him in the front rank of his profession, W. C. Bonuerjee. These five men presided over, and the balance held even between them, by such an one as the Governor of Bombay or Madras would, I believe, produce a scheme which would secure the approval of the Government, allay the fears of the timid, and satisfy the aspiring ones among us for a generation at least. (*Loud cheers.*)

LORD DUFFERIN ON THE DEMANDS OF THE CONGRESS

I fear I have occupied your time to an unreasonable length, but I wish to trespass on your indulgence for a short time longer for the purpose of making a few remarks on the speech of the ex-Viceroy at the Scotch Dinner in Calcutta. All movements of the kind in which we are

concerned pass through several phases as they run their course. The first is one of ridicule. That is followed, as the movement progresses, by one of abuse, which is usually succeeded by partial concession and misapprehension of aim, accompanied by warnings against taking "big jumps into the unknown." The final stage of all is a substantial adoption of the subject of the movement with some expression of surprise that it was not adopted before. These various phases overlap each other, but between the first and last the distinction is complete.

Well, we are out and away from the comical aspect of the movement. It has become too serious for that and we are midway between the abusive and misapprehensive stages. In the speech of our ex Viceroy we have, as might be expected, none of the coarser instruments of attack—indeed, I find a vein of sympathy with us running through his speech—and we have partial concession, misapprehension regarding some of our demands, and in consequence, the usual warning voice. The concession I refer to is as regards the separation of the Executive and Judicial functions. This was one of the ridiculous proposals, one of those school-boy clamours to start with, but the Viceroy now tells us that "this is a counsel of perfection to which we are ready to subscribe." Allow me to congratulate you upon this concession so frankly and handsomely made. All that we want now is to see the concession of the principle reduced into practice. (*Hear, hear.*) The misapprehension is contained in the following sentence:—

The ideal authoritatively suggested, as I understand, is the creation of a representative body or bodies, in which the official element shall be in a minority, who shall have what is called the power of the purse, and who through this instrumentality shall be able to bring the British Executive into subjection to their will.

Now, Gentlemen, if there be one thing more than another that we have tried to make clear, it is that the British Executive should continue to be paramount in the Councils. We have made it as clear as the English language is capable of expressing thought, that the utmost we want is that half of the Councils be elected; the other

half to be wholly in the nomination of the Government. These may be all officials or not, just as the Government pleases, and we have made it equally clear, in addition, that the Government should have the right to veto all adverse votes. Such an arrangement guarantees the supremacy of the Executive under all circumstances, aye, even if their own side vote against them. But, is it to be assumed that the elected members are all to vote adversely? Is it to be supposed that any measure of the Executive will be such as to be condemned by every section of the community? I hope no British Executive will ever take leaps into the dark to lead to such a result. Well, the Viceroy having started upon an assumption that is not only incorrect, but is the very opposite of the fact, it follows that his condemnation does not apply to us at all, but to a fanciful piece of workmanship of which we are not the artists. The Viceroy must necessarily depend largely upon his subordinates for correct information about the details of this and other movements, and it looks to me as if one of those compilers of fact had fallen into some grievous error. The authoritative views of the Congress are to be found in its resolutions, and the resolution about the reform of the Councils is the third one of the first meeting of the Congress three years ago, and that resolution has been the one affirmed at the following meetings. We are in no way bound even by any statement or argument that any speaker may make in supporting that resolution; but I say with the greatest confidence that, neither in the resolution itself, nor in the speeches of the gentlemen supporting it, is a word to be found that justifies the "ideal authoritatively suggested." There may be some remarks in letters to newspapers, in pamphlets, or in speeches made by members of the Congress that give support to the "ideal." I don't know of them, and if I did, I should regret them, just as I might regret any of our members having a hump back; but I should feel no responsibility for either his back or speech. If we be charged with encouraging "ideals" on such grounds, we may as logically be charged, in the other event, as a Congress for promoting deformed spines! (*Hear, hear, and laughter.*) It is

annoying to us no doubt, that our friends, as I take Lord Dufferin to be, should be deceived by imitations of our ticket; but as we have no Trade Mark Bill to protect our wares, all that we can do is to warn our friends to ask for the real article and see that they get it. (*Loud and continued cheers.*)

INDIANS ARE THE HEIRS OF A BETTER HOPE

And now, Gentlemen, I wish to say, in conclusion, that I have a strong faith that our limited enfranchisement is in the near and not in the distant future. No rational mind can believe that the present system can go on for ever—that it is the last will and dying testament of Providence regarding us. (*Laughter.*) We are, I trust, the heirs of a better hope. A careful reading of the speeches and writings of our leading officials leads me to believe that they would be glad to see this matter settled; and I do not exclude Sir Auckland Colvin from this category. His objection seems to be to some of the by-play and not to the general drift of the drama. The great difficulty hitherto has been to find the time to deal with the subject. Lord Dufferin had his thoughts too fully occupied with the troubles on the frontier and in Burma to give adequate attention to this question, which is apparent in the mistake he has fallen into regarding our demands. And I, for one, regret that it has not fallen to his lot to add a new lustre to his name, and to establish a further claim upon our regard by promoting a measure such as we advocate—a measure which any statesman might well be proud to be the instrument of carrying; for it is one which (while going a long way, if not the whole way, in calming the present agitation) would draw into closer connection the two extreme branches of the Aryan race, the common subjects of the Queen-Empress: a measure which would unite England and India, not by the hard and brittle bonds of arbitrary rule which may snap in a moment, but by the flexible and more enduring ligaments of common interests promoted, common duties discharged, by means of a common service, chosen with some regard to the principles of representative government.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN

I thank you, Gentlemen, from the bottom of my heart for the great honour you have conferred upon me. I beg leave also to offer my acknowledgments to the mover, the seconder and the supporter of this Resolution for the gracious terms in which they have referred to my past connection with India. After our long acquaintance it seems hardly necessary that I should assure you of my feeling of goodwill towards the people of India. (*Cheers.*) But I will mention this one fact, that I have passed a quarter of a century among you, and during that period of time I have not known what it was to suffer an unkindness from a native of India. During that period I have been in the service of the people of India, and have eaten their salt. (*Loud and continued cheering.*) And I hope to devote to their service what still remains to me of active life. I take this chair to-day with much pleasure and pride. It warms my heart to receive this mark of confidence from the Indian people. And I rejoice to take part in a movement so well calculated to promote the best interests of India and of England. (*Cheers.*)

CONGRESS MOVEMENT

I have watched from its commencement the movement which has now culminated in the Indian National Congress. And in my humble judgment the movement is unmitigated good in its origin, objects, and its methods. As regards its historical origin, we know that it is the direct result of the noblest efforts of British statesmanship: the natural and healthy fruit of higher education and free institutions freely granted to the people of India. Again, what are the practical objects of the Congress movement? They are to revive the National life, and to increase the material prosperity of the country; and what better object.

could we have before us ? Lastly, as regards our methods, they are open and constitutional, and based solely on India's reliance upon British justice and love of fair play. Looking back to the history of the movement, there was one critical time in its development : that was about ten years ago. The leaven was then actually at work, though the purpose of the movement was not then so well defined, and it was unwisely sought to deal with it by a policy of repression. The results might have been disastrous. But happily that time of tribulation was cut short by the arrival of the greatest and best of all our Viceroy's, the Marquis of Ripon. (*Loud cheers.*) By his wise and sympathetic policy, Lord Ripon met and fulfilled the aspirations of the national movement. And on their side the people of India recognised that a Government conducted in such a spirit could not be regarded as an alien rule. This was the meaning of the passionate demonstrations at the time of Lord Ripon's departure. You, Gentlemen, will correct me if I am wrong in saying that those demonstrations were a popular declaration that on such terms British rule could be accepted as the national government of the Indian people. (*Long and enthusiastic cheers.*)

INDIAN AFFAIRS IN ENGLAND

But, Gentlemen, you know all this as well as I do, and better. I think what you want to hear from me is not so much about your affairs in India as about your affairs in England. I have been nearly three years away from you and have been studying English politics with special reference to Indian interests. And you would like to know what are the results. You will naturally ask me, what are the prospects of the Congress movement in England ? What are the obstacles which we have to overcome ? And what are the practical objects to which our activity can best be directed ? To those inquiries I would reply generally that our hopes depend entirely upon the degree to which the British people can be induced to exert their power with reference to India. Our one great ultimate question is that of a Parliamentary control over Indian affairs. If that can be obtained, all will be well. The

case of India in England is really a simple one. The Crown and Parliament of Great Britain have laid down certain broad and liberal principles for the administration of India, and have solemnly pledged themselves that these shall be acted on. With those principles the people of India are fully satisfied. But the difficulty is in the practice. For, owing to the necessity of the case, the actual administration has to be entrusted to official agents in India. And the problem is, how under the circumstances can an effectual control be exercised from England so as to ensure these principles being carried out and these pledges fulfilled? Unfortunately there is one very serious fact which much enhances the difficulty of this problem, and it is this, that in certain important particulars the professional interests of our official administrators in India are in antagonism with the interests of the Indian taxpayer, whose affairs they administer. This is a somewhat delicate matter, but it is an important one, and I feel it my duty to speak out clearly. Perhaps also it is easier for me than for most people to speak freely regarding the Indian official class, and that for two reasons. First, because I am deeply interested personally in the honour of that class. (*Hear, hear.*) The Indian Civil Service has been a sort of hereditary calling in our family since the beginning of the century. My father entered the Civil Service in 1807; and my eldest brother followed him, until he lost his life in the Bengal mutinies. I came out shortly afterwards so that we are identified with what may be called the Indian official caste. The other reason is, because my complaint is against the system, not against the men who carry it out. On the contrary, it is my deliberate belief that the Indian Civil and Military services have never been surpassed for honest hard work and selfish devotion to duty. (*Cheers.*) Such being the case, I have no hesitation in repeating that the interests of the Indian services are in great measure antagonistic to the interests of the Indian taxpayer. The main interests of the Indian taxpayer are: peace, economy and reform. But all those are necessarily distasteful to the civil and military classes. A spirited and well-equipped army naturally desires, not peace, but active

service. And who can reasonably expect officials to love economy, which means reduction of their own salaries; or reform, which means restriction of their authority? (*Cheers and laughter.*) It cannot be expected that as a class our official administrators in India will work for peace, economy and reform. But this very fact makes all the more urgent the necessity for a control in England which shall be both vigilant and effectual. We have, therefore, now to see what is the state of that control. Is it strong, vigilant, and effectual? I am sorry to say that the answer to this question is highly unsatisfactory.

A REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL

A brief historical review will, I fear, show that, in the matter of Parliamentary control, things have gone from bad to worse, until they are now about as bad as can be. It is now more than a hundred years ago since Edmund Burke (*cheers*) pointed out the crying need for a strong impartial control in England over Indian affairs. And Mr. Fox's India Bill would have provided an organised machinery for exercising this control. But unhappily, owing to party struggles unconnected with India, this Bill fell through, "India's Magna Charta," as Burke called it, and never since has a similar attempt been made. But although no remedy was then applied, things were not so bad until the passing of the Government of India Act in 1858, which transferred the Government from the Company to the Crown. It is from that Act that I date our principal misfortunes. Till then we had two important safeguards. The first was the wholesome jealousy felt by Parliament towards the East India Company as a privileged Corporation. The other was the necessity for the renewal of the Company's charter at the end of every 30 years. At each of those renewals, the Company's official administration had to justify its existence; there was a searching inquiry into grievances: and there never was a renewal without the grant to the public of important reforms and concessions suited to the progressive condition of Indian affairs. (*Cheers.*) Now unfortunately both those safeguards are lost. The official

administrators, who used to be viewed with jealousy, have now been admitted into the innermost sanctum of authority; and, as Council to the Secretary of State, form a Secret Court of Appeal for the hearing of all Indian complaints. They first decide all matters in India, and then retire to the Indian Council at Westminster to sit in appeal on their own decisions. Such a method of control is a mockery, a snare and a delusion. This evil is very far reaching, for when a decision is passed at the India Office, the Secretary of State becomes committed to it, so that if an independent member tries to take up the case in the House of Commons, he finds himself confronted, not by a discredited company, but by the full power of the Treasury Bench. But the loss of the periodical inquiry once at least in 30 years is perhaps a still more serious disaster. There is now no day of reckoning. And Indian reformers find all their efforts exhausted in the vain attempt to obtain a Parliamentary inquiry such as was before provided without demand and without effort. At the present moment such an inquiry is much overdue. The last periodical inquiry was held in 1854, so that under the old system a Parliamentary inquiry would have been begun five years ago. But although such an inquiry has been constantly asked for, and has been promised, it has never been granted. No doubt we shall manage to get it in the end, but it will be at the cost of much wasted energy.

HOW PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL WORKS IN PRACTICE

I think, Gentlemen, I have shown that the last state of our control is worse than the first. On the one hand we have been deprived of our periodical inquiry into grievances, while on the other hand, all complaints are calmly referred for disposal to the very officials against whom the complaints are made. (*Hear, hear.*) I should like, by way of illustration, to give a couple of instances to show how this system works in practice. The first case I will take is that which was well known at the time as the Break of Gauge Controversy. In that matter General Strachey, as Public Works Member of the Viceroy's Council, held his own against the whole united public opinion.

of India, European and Native, official and unofficial ; and the railway gauge was fixed in the way he wished it. Later on, the question came in appeal to the Secretary of State. But by that time General Strachey had retired from his position in India, and had been appointed to the India Council (*laughter*) where he was the official adviser of the Secretary of State in matters relative to railways and public works. When, therefore, the public fancied they were appealing from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, they were really enjoying an appeal from General Strachey to himself. (*Laughter.*) This instance shows how the system of the India Council is even worse in fact than in theory. One might perhaps suppose that there being 15 members of the Council, one's grievance might come before those not personally affected. But such is not the case. Each member is considered as an expert, as regards his particular province or department, and is allowed to ride his own hobby, provided he allows his colleagues also to ride their own hobbies in the way they choose. The other instance is taken from my own experience, and has reference to Agricultural Banks. We cherish the idea that if he had fair play, the ryot might develop into a substantial yeoman instead of being the starveling he is. With a fertile soil, a glorious sun, and abundance of highly skilled labour, there is no reason why India should not become a garden if the ryots were not crushed by his debts. The only thing that is required is capital, in order to settle these old debts and make advances to the ryots on reasonable terms, so that they may be supplied with water for irrigation and manure. As you know, we prepared a practical scheme, founded on the German system of peasant Banks, and got all the parties concerned to agree to it. The Bombay Government approved of the experiment, which was to be on a very limited scale ; and the scheme was forwarded for sanction to the Secretary of State by Lord Ripon's Government, Sir Evelyn Baring as Finance Minister having agreed to advance 5 lakhs of rupees for the settlement of the old debts. In England, the scheme was well received. Mr. John Bright took the chair at a meeting

in Exeter Hall in furtherance of the project, and each of the leading London daily papers expressed approval. The Manchester Chamber of Commerce also memorialized the Secretary of State in its favour. Well, Gentlemen, this scheme entered the portals of the India Office, and never left it alive. (*Shame.*) It was stabbed in the dark, no one knows by what hand or for what reason. Not long ago our friend Mr. Samuel Smith asked a question about it in the House of Commons; he inquired why the experiment recommended by Lord Ripon's Government was not allowed; and he was informed by Sir John Gorst that the scheme was not considered "practicable". Not practicable indeed! I wonder whether Sir J. Gorst is aware that in Germany alone there are 2,000 such Agricultural Banks in active working, and that throughout the Continent of Europe it is admitted that without such financial institutions, the present proprietor is absolutely unable to maintain himself without falling into the clutches of the village usurer. I think I may say with confidence that the India Office has not yet heard the last word on the subject of Agricultural Banks in India. (*Cheers.*)

ORGANISED FORCES OF INDIA'S OPPONENTS IN ENGLAND.

I fear, therefore, that in reviewing the situation in England, we must admit that the organized forces are in the hands of our opponents. The India Office is strong against us, together with the influence of the services and of society. The London Press is not favourable to us. And those Members of Parliament who have Indian experience rank themselves mostly on the official side. On the other hand, we need not lose hope; for the spirit of the age is on our side. The forces of the new democracy are in favour of national aspirations; and wherever meetings of working men are addressed, they are found willing, nay eager, that justice should be done to India. (*Cheers.*) My friend has referred to the constituency of North Ayrshire, which has been good enough on the liberal side to choose me as its candidate; and he hoped that my invitation to come out here would

not in any way damage my chances. I am very glad to assure you that so far from damaging my chances, it has very much raised me in their estimation. (*Loud Cheers.*) As soon as my supporters in North Ayrshire learned that I had been invited to preside at this Congress, they were highly gratified, and resolutions were passed expressing strong sympathy with the Indian people. Nor is it on the liberal side only that India has active sympathisers. She has many good friends among Conservatives; and to those I think we may reasonably appeal in the matter of Parliamentary control over Indian affairs. It is sometimes said that Conservatives walk in the footsteps of good reformers; that is, they stand now in the position that good reformers stood in perhaps 50 years ago. If this is so, we may well ask their help to carry through the reforms that commended themselves to Burke and to Fox; and still more to restore that 30 years' periodical inquiry which was originally secured to us by the wisdom of our ancestors. (*Cheers.*)

CONGRESS AGENCIES IN LONDON

And if the older organizations are against us, we have younger organizations which are making good and healthy growth. First and foremost, the Indian National Congress is becoming a household word in England; and it will become a power in the State, if you continue patient, persistent, moderate. Then again, you have done well and wisely to establish organization No. 2, a Congress Agency in London. In the Indian National Congress, the people of India, hitherto dumb, have found a voice. But the distance to England is great, and the agency is needed, like a telephone, to carry the voice of the people of India to the ear of the people of England. It seems to me that the Agency, under your indefatigable Secretary, Mr. William Digby (*loud cheers*), is simply invaluable in bringing India in contact with her friends in England, and in briefing those friends when they take up Indian subjects either in Parliament or before the public. Also the agency, with the Committee which supervises its working, will, we hope, be the nucleus

round which an Indian party will gradually gather itself. This will be our organization No. 3, the Indian Parliamentary Party, consisting of men who, however different their views may be on other subjects, are willing to co-operate on the basis of a just and sympathetic policy towards India. The meeting three weeks ago, at the National Liberal Club, under the presidency of our valued friend Mr. George Yule, was the first movement towards the formation of such a party. Strong sympathy was then expressed with the objects of the Congress: and it is hoped that when Parliament meets, arrangements will be made to secure joint action in matters affecting Indian interests. But, Gentlemen, I have not come to the end of our list of activities on behalf of India. I rejoice to learn that a group of Indian speakers of weight and experience are about to proceed to England, in company with our General Secretary (*loud cheers*) for the purpose of initiating a systematic propaganda by addressing popular audiences at the great centres of population throughout Great Britain. You will know well how to address those great audiences, appealing fearlessly to the highest motives, and calling on the people of England to perform their trust and duty towards the unrepresented millions of India: appeals to unselfishness, to justice, and to humanity will ever find a sure response from the great heart of the British people. (*Cheers.*)

ENGLISHMEN AND THE CONGRESS

In conclusion, I would like to address a few words to those of our English friends who distrust the Congress movement. The promoters of the Congress profess strong attachment to British rule. And I would ask, is there any reason to doubt this profession? (*"No, no."*) Have those men any interests antagonistic to our rule? (*"No, no."*) Remember that the originators of this movement are educated men, trained up by us in a love of freedom and free institutions. Is it likely that these men should wish to exchange the rule of England, the freest and the most enlightened country in the world, for that of Russia which is one of the most barbarous and retrograde? (*Cheers.*)

I remember being much struck with the remark of a native friend of mine with reference to Russian advances. He said to me:

If India is lost we are the chief losers; you can go to your ships and will be safe in your distant homes. We, on the other hand, should lose all: our country, our liberties, and our hopes for the regeneration of our race.

Perhaps some of our doubting English friends will say: "We attach more importance to deeds than to words." I think we can point also to deeds. It is well known that in all schemes for the invasion of India, the Russian Generals depend for success on a hoped-for rising of the native population. In 1885, they appear to have put this idea to the test by a pretended advance. Had this move been followed by any signs of sympathy, or even by an ominous silence of expectancy throughout India, Russia would have rejoiced, and we should have felt our position weakened. But India does not treat England's difficulty as her opportunity. On the contrary, there went up on all sides a patriotic cry, led by the native press, calling on all to join with men and money, and make a common cause against the common foe. (*Cheers.*) I think also the action of the Congress, when calmly viewed, will be seen to point in the same direction. The man who points out the rocks and shoals towards which the ship is moving, is the friend of the captain, not the enemy. And that is the light in which the Government should regard the criticisms of the Congress. The moderate reforms proposed by the Congress will all tend to make the people of India more prosperous and more contented, and will thereby strengthen the foundations of British rule. (*Cheers.*) And here I would specially invite our English commercial friends to join with us in our efforts to increase the material prosperity of the country. At present, owing to the poverty of the people, the trade is nothing in comparison with what it ought to be. This is an argument which has been effectively pressed by our veteran leader, Dadabhai Naoroji. He has pointed out that our Australian colonies take English goods at the rate of £17 or £18 per head per annum, whereas poor India can only take at

the rate of eighteen pence a head. If, by releasing him from his bonds of debt, and placing him in a position to exercise his industry, we could make the ryot moderately prosperous, how great would be the benefit to English trade ! If the Indian customer could take even £1 a head, the exports to India would exceed the exports to all the rest of the world put together. I would, therefore, say to our mercantile friends, help us to make the ryot prosperous, and your commercial business will soon increase by leaps and bounds.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CHARLES BRADLAUGH

Gentlemen, I have now concluded my preliminary remarks, and I thank you for the patience with which you have heard me, and have now to invite you to attack, with good appetite, the substantial bill of fare which will be placed before you. I will not in any way anticipate your proceedings, but I may perhaps express a hope that you will give early and earnest attention to the Bill for the Reform of the Legislative Council. And in connection with this Bill, I would take the opportunity to congratulate you on the presence here to-day of a very distinguished visitor—one whose name is a synonym for independence, for strength, and for success. I think poor India is very fortunate in securing such a champion as Mr. Charles Bradlaugh (*loud and continued cheers*), a very Charles Martel of these later days, whose sledge-hammer blows have often shaken to their foundations the citadels of prejudice, of ignorance, and of oppression.

To-day there only remains to appoint, as usual, a Subjects Committee, and I will ask you to do this before we separate.

Gentlemen, I will not detain you longer, but will only express my earnest hope that your labours may prosper and that your deliberations may effectually promote "the safety, honor and welfare of Her Majesty and her dominions." (*Loud and long continued cheers, followed by a general rising and waving of handkerchiefs and a final "One cheer more!"*).

MR. PHEROZESHAH MEHTA

LADIES and Gentlemen,—I beg to tender to you my most sincere thanks for the honour you have done me in calling me to preside over your deliberations this year. I cannot imagine a greater honour for a native of this country than to be elected, by your free and spontaneous suffrages, President of an assembly which is now one of the recognized institutions of the country—an unconventional convention of the Empire which, we may say without undue ostentation, has already earned a place in history—not less surely, let us trust, than the famous St. Andrew's Dinners of the city—as making an epoch in the march of events moulding the lofty destinies of the magnificent land. In speaking of myself as a native of this country, I am not unaware that, incredible as it may seem, Parsis have been both called and invited and allured to call themselves foreigners. If twelve centuries, however, entitle Angles and Saxons, and Normans and Danes, to call themselves natives of England, if a lesser period entitles the Indian Mahomedans to call themselves natives of India, surely we are born children of the soil, in which our lot has been cast for a period of over thirteen centuries, and where ever since the advent of the British power, we have lived and worked with our Hindu and Mahomedan neighbours for common aims, common aspirations and common interests. To my mind, a Parsi is a better and a truer Parsi as a Mahomedan or a Hindu is a better and truer Mahomedan or Hindu; the more he is attached to the land which gave him birth, the more he is bound in brotherly relations and affection to all the children of the soil, the more he recognizes the fraternity of all the native communities of the country, and the immutable bond which binds them.

together in the pursuit of common aims and objects under a common Government. Is it possible to imagine that Dadabhai Naoroji, for instance, true Parsi that he is, is anything but an Indian, living and working all his life for all India, with the true and tender loyalty of a son? Can any one doubt, if I may be allowed to take another illustration, that Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was greater and nobler when he was devoting the great energies and talents with which he is endowed—if for the benefit of Mahomedans in particular—for the benefit of all Indians in general, than when, as of late, he was preaching a gospel of selfishness and isolation? The birthright, therefore, Gentlemen, which the Parsis thus possess of so indefeasible and glorious a character, they have refused and will always refuse to sell for any mess of pottage, however fragrant and tempting. (*Loud cheers.*) More especially, therefore, as an Indian it is that I return to you my grateful thanks for the honor you have done me.

INDIAN POLITICAL PROGRESS

I have ventured, Gentlemen, to ascribe to the Congress the credit of making an epoch in Indian political progress. A very brief survey of the incidents of the twelve months that have elapsed since we last met will amply justify our title to that distinction. In the admirable address, which was delivered by my predecessor in this chair at Allahabad, Mr. Yule pointed out that all movements of the kind in which we are concerned pass through several phases as they run their course. The first is one of ridicule. That is followed, as the movement progresses, by one of abuse, which is usually succeeded by partial concession, and misapprehension of aim, accompanied by warnings against taking big jumps into the unknown. The final stage of all is a substantial adoption of the object of the movement, with some expression of surprise that it was not adopted before. Well, Gentlemen, we have pretty well passed the first two stages. We have survived the ridicule, the abuse, and the misrepresentation. We have survived the charge of sedition and disloyalty. We have survived the charge of being a microscopic minority. We have also survived the

charge of being guilty of the atrocious crime of being educated, and we have even managed to survive the grievous charge of being all Babus in disguise. (*Laughter and cheers.*)

WHAT INDIANS REALLY WANT

The question of our loyalty is set at rest for ever. In the debate on Lord Cross's India Reform Bill in the House of Lords, Viceroy after Viceroy bore emphatic testimony to the loyal and peaceful character of our aims and efforts. Within the last few days the voice of no less a personage than one of our former Secretaries of State has confirmed this testimony. Lord R. Churchill—it is to no less distinguished a public man that I refer—has publicly declared that :

He could sincerely remark that no one will rejoice more than himself if the deliberations of the Indian National Congress shortly to be resumed were to contribute effectually to the progress and the welfare of the Indian people.

Then, Gentlemen, it is made clear that we have not learnt the lessons of history so badly as to demand the introduction of the full-blown representative institutions which, in England, have been the growth of centuries. It is made clear that we have not asked for even such a modicum as was enjoyed by the English people even before the time of Simon de Montfort, more than five centuries ago, nay, that we have not asked even for representative institutions of a governing or ruling character at all. Indeed, so far as this historical argument is concerned, we have not alone proved that we have not been guilty of disregarding it, but we have been successful in turning the table upon our adversaries. We have shown that it is they who defy the lessons of history and experience, when they talk of waiting to make a beginning till the masses of the people are fully equipped with all the virtues and all the qualifications which adorn the citizens of Utopia, in fact, till a millennium has set in, when we should hardly require such institutions at all. We have shown that people who indulge in such vain talk have never understood the laws of human

progress, which, after all, is a series of experiments in which men and institutions react upon each other for their mutual improvement and perfection.

ANGLO-INDIAN KNOWLEDGE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

We have also proved that, in spite of our education, and even with our racial and religious differences, the microscopic minority can far better and far more intuitively represent the needs and the aspirations of their own countrymen than the still more microscopic minority of the omniscient District Officers, whose colloquial knowledge of the Indian languages seldom rise above the knowledge of English possessed, for instance, by French waitors at Paris Hotels which proudly blazon forth the legend : *Ici on parle Anglais* ; and whose knowledge of native domestic and social life, and ways and habits of thought seldom extends beyond a familiarity with flattering expressions of the Saheb's greatness and paternal care, sometimes inspired by courtesy and sometimes by interest. An amusing story was related to me of a little incident that occurred only the other day which is not without instruction at illustrating the amount of knowledge possessed by Anglo-Indians of the people among whom they have moved for years. The wife of a member of Parliament who has come out on a visit to India this year—herself as distinguished as her husband for her kindly sympathy in Indian welfare—was sitting at dinner next to a learned member of my profession, who in the course of conversation, grew humorous and sarcastic by turns, in the fashion of Mr. Rudyard Kipling, on the ridiculous and outrageous pretensions of globe-trotters to know the country and its people better than Anglo-Indians who had lived in it for years. He was rattling away, well satisfied with himself and the impression he thought he was producing on the lady, when with the sweetest of smiles, she gently asked him how long he had been himself in India. Fifteen years—more or less—was the answer. I suppose you know well Mr.—naming a gentleman whose recent elevation to the Bench of one of our High Courts was received everywhere with pleasure and approbation. Of course, I do, said his brother in the same profession.

Can you tell me if he has only one wife or more than one? Slowly came the answer: No, I fear I can't. Well, I can tell you; you see I have been only a few days in the country, said the lady quietly, and yet I think I know a thing or two which you don't. I trust my learned friend, who is the hero of this story, was properly grateful to the lady for giving him some serious food for reflection.

MAHOMEDANS AND THE CONGRESS

Then, Gentlemen, our right to the designation of a national body has been vindicated. It is so admirably set forth in an article which appeared in a Conservative Review—*The National*—from the pen of a Conservative who, however, speaks from the fullness of intimate knowledge that I cannot resist the temptation of borrowing from it:

The supposed rivalry, says the writer, between Mussulmans and Hindus is a convenient decoy to distract attention and to defer the day of reform. I do not wish to affirm that there is no antagonism between the adherents of the two faiths; but I do most positively assert that the antagonism has been grossly exaggerated. Every municipal improvement and charitable work finds members of the two faiths working together and subscribing funds to carry it out. Every political paper in the country finds supporters from believers in both creeds. Just the same is witnessed in the proceedings of the Congress. The members of the Congress met together as men, on the common basis of nationality, being citizens of one country, subjects of one power, amenable to one code of laws taxed by one authority, influenced for weal or woe by one system of administration, urged by like impulses to secure like rights and to be relieved of like burdens. If these are not sufficient causes to weld a people together into one common alliance of nationality, it is difficult to conceive what would be sufficient. It is for this reason the organization has been called the Indian National Congress; not because, as many besides Mr. Keane have assumed that it claims a non-existent unity of race, but because it deals with rights and interests which are national in character, and matters in which all the inhabitants of the Indian peninsula are equally concerned.

I think we may take it, Gentlemen, that we have passed through the first two stages, and that the loyalty, the moderation, the propriety, and the constitutional and national character of our mission are now established beyond a doubt. But, however arduous and however provoking some of the experiences of the trial through which

we have passed, they should not leave any trace of bitterness behind. For, let us not imagine that they were devoid of chastening and beneficial effects upon ourselves. Let us frankly acknowledge that they also must have had their share in contributing to add clearness to our thoughts, sobriety to our methods, and moderation to our proposals. If I might use a proscribed, but not unscriptural, phrase, we must give even the devil his due. (*Laughter.*)

THE ERA OF CONGRESS ACHIEVEMENT

It is on the third stage—the era of achievement—that we have now entered. It is true that a majority of the Congress proposals do not still seem to have made much headway. Even as regards the proposal to separate the Executive and the Judicial functions, lauded by Lord Dufferin “as a counsel of perfection to which the Government were ready to subscribe,” Government are yet so absorbed in admiration of it that they have not recovered themselves sufficiently to take action. There is, however, no reason to despair. It was once proved upon sworn testimony in the Bombay High Court, before the late Chief Justice Sir M. Westropp, that a woman required 22 months for parturition in the air of the province of Kattyawar. It is not impossible, Gentlemen, that the air of Simla may similarly necessitate a more than ordinarily long period of gestation to perfect even counsels of perfection; and therefore, we must possess our souls in more than ordinary patience, lest any precipitate pressure might occasion a miscarriage. (*Laughter.*) In one little matter, complete success has attended our efforts, *viz.*, as regards the duty on silver-plate. The Abkari cause is also safe in the custody of that redoubtable champion of whose formidable prowess you can form some idea, when you remember that it was he who so completely put to rout Mr. Goschen’s compensation clauses. It is a matter of no small congratulation to us to welcome Mr. Caine as one of our own delegates. He first came out to this country with a free and open mind on the Congress question; with that fearless independence which characterizes him, and which always, when I see him, recalls to my mind those famous

lines of Burns: "The man of independent mind is king of men for a' that." He went for his education to Aligarh. Thanks to Mr. Th. Beck and Sir Syed Ahmed, he has come to us, not only a staunch Congressman in principles, but as one of the Indian Political Agency, he has thrown his indomitable energy and his high-souled advocacy into active support of the movement. Mr. Caine can truly boast that, if he has not succeeded in extorting from Mr. Prichard and all the most zealous Abkari officers the confession that they are Bacchus and his crew in disguise, they dare not, at least, throw off their masks while his watchful eye is upon them, but must continue to do penance in the assumed garb of uncomfortable and uncongenial principles. Leaving Christian to continue his combat with Apollyon, it is when we come to the central proposal of the Congress regarding the Legislative Councils for the purpose of expanding and putting life in them that we can congratulate ourselves on being on the verge of an important step. Many have been the circumstances, and many the forces and influences, that have contributed to this result. First and foremost among them is the circumstance that, without legal votes and legal qualifications, we have had the good fortune to become possessed of a member of our own in Parliament. Do not imagine, Gentlemen, that Dadabhai Naoroji or Lalmohan Ghose has at length been returned.

CHARLES BRADLAUGH'S SERVICES TO INDIA

But what member, even if we had the direct franchise, could have served us as Mr. Bradlaugh has done during the last twelve months? To say that the whole country is grateful to him for the untiring energy, the indefatigable care, the remarkable ability with which he has watched and worked for its best interests in that House, where he has achieved so honorable a position for himself, can only most imperfectly express the depth and extent of the sentiments that are felt for him throughout the length and breadth of the land. His name has literally become a household word. He is raising up to himself a memorial in the hearts of the people of India, which will

reflect more lustre on his name than titles and orders, and endure longer than monuments of brass or marble.
(*Loud cheers.*)

We have been fortunate indeed in securing the sympathies of such a champion. No sooner did he return to England than he at once proceeded to redeem the promise he had made on that behalf, by introducing in the House of Commons his India Councils Reform Bill, drawn on the lines which were sketched and formulated at the last Congress, and with which you are all familiar under its justly deserved brief designation of the Madras Scheme. Two important results were the immediate outcome of this step. The scheme which was thus propounded was in its nature a tentative measure, so far as its details were concerned; and it at once drew forth useful and guiding criticism. In several respects its scope was misunderstood, especially as regards its supposed sweeping character which might have been avoided, had we specified in the Congress skeleton sketch the restrictive limitations hedging the qualifications of the electorate. The criticisms of men like Sir W. Hunter and Sir R. Garth, for whose thoughtful, sympathetic and friendly attitude towards Indian progress, we are always so deeply grateful, exposed, however, one defect demanding serious consideration, *viz*, that the scheme was laid on new lines, and had a somewhat theoretical air, which Englishmen rather fight shy of in practical politics. In justice to the scheme, however, it should be said that Sir Richard Garth put his finger on a possible, rather than a probable, result when he thought that it would enable the Hindus to submerge the other Indian communities. Experience has shown that even in a preponderating Hindu electorate, it does not happen that Hindus only are elected, as so many other, besides racial forces and interests concur in influencing the selection. If we may apply the lessons learnt from experience in municipal elections, I may mention the remarkable fact that in the Town Council or, what is now called the Standing Committee of the Bombay Corporation, composed of 12 members, there have been frequently 5 Parsis,

3 Europeans, 2 Hindus and 2 Mahomedans. Sir R. Garth's criticism on this point, however, throws out a warning which should not be hastily disregarded.

LORD CROSS'S INDIAN COUNCILS BILL

But the next result, which the introduction of Mr. Bradlaugh's bill achieved, was gratifying in the highest degree. It at once dispelled the fit of profound cogitation, in which men at the head of Indian affairs are so apt to be lost, that they can never spontaneously recover from it. Lord Cross's Indian Councils Bill promptly saw the light of day in the House of Lords. It was at once the official recognition of the *raison d'etre* of the Congress, and the first fruits of its labours. In itself, however, it was a most halting and unsatisfactory measure. In framing it, the Prime Minister and the Indian Secretary of State seem to have been pervaded with a conception of the Indian people as a sort of Oliver Twist, always asking for more, to whom it would be, therefore, a piece of prudent policy to begin with offering as little as possible. The Government Bill may be aptly described as a most superb steam-engine in which the necessary material to generate steam was carefully excluded, substituting in its place coloured shams to look like it. The rights of interpellation and of the discussion of the Budget were granted, but the living forces of the elective principle, which alone could properly work them, were not breathed into the organization of the enlarged Councils. The omission of the elective principle from the Bill was boldly justified by Lord Salisbury on the ground that

the principle of election or government by representation was not an eastern idea, and that it did not fit eastern traditions or eastern minds.

I wish to speak of his Lord with all the respect to which his high talents and great intellectual attainments justly entitle him; but it is not a little surprising as well as disappointing to find the Prime Minister of England, a statesman who, as Lord Cranborne, was once Secretary of State for India, displaying such profound ignorance of the

history of the Indian people and the genius of the Indian mind. The late Mr. Chisolm Ansty, a man of immense erudition, once pointed out at a meeting of the East India Association in London, that :

We are apt to forget in this country when we talk of preparing people in the East by education, and all that sort of thing, for municipal government and parliamentary government, that the East is the parent of municipalities. Local self-government in the widest acceptance of the term is as old as the East itself. No matter what may be the religion of the people who inhabit what we call the East, there is not a portion of the country from west to east, from north to south, which is not swarming with municipalities, and not only so, but like to our municipalities of old, they are all bound together as in a species of network so that you have ready-made to your hand the framework of a great system of representation.

Sir H. Maine has shown that the Teutonic Mark was hardly so well organized or so essentially representative as an Indian village community, until the precise technical Roman form was engrafted upon it. (*Cheers.*)

LORD SALISBURY'S ATTITUDE ON INDIAN COUNCILS BILL.

But leaving village communities alone, what do we find at the present day over the whole country but all sorts and conditions of people, from the highest to the lowest, meeting together and transacting the business of their numberless castes, in assemblies which, in their constitution and their mode of working, are the exact prototypes of the Saxon Witans, from which the English Parliamentary institutions have sprung. It is true that circumstances never allowed the representative genius of the people to develop forms and organizations for higher political functions. But it is no less true that the seed and the soil are there, waiting only for the skilful hand and the watchful mind, which we of the Congress firmly believe we have secured in the presence of Englishmen in this country. The disdainful attitude of Lord Salisbury as to our aptitude for representative institutions need, however, bring no despair to our minds. His late Chief, Lord Beaconsfield, once said of him on a memorable occasion that he was a man who never measured his phrases or his sweeping assertions. On the contrary, I draw an augury of good

hope from his pronouncement and that made by his son Lord Hugh Cecil that:

the Indian was not only a good government but it was probably the best conceivable government that the population could possibly live under.

On the eve of the passing of the great English Reform Bill, the Duke of Wellington, then the Tory Prime Minister, proclaimed in the same House of Lords that the existing constitution of the House of Commons was perfect and that the wit of man could not *a priori* have devised anything so perfect. The declaration was received by the Liberals as a sure portent of victory; and the Reform Bill was passed within little more than a year after. I trust that the Salisbury pronouncement may prove prophetic in the same way. (*Cheers.*)

CHARLES BRADLAUGH'S INDIAN COUNCILS BILL

It is needless to discuss Lord Cross's perfunctory measure any further; even with the amendment which Lord Northbrook succeeded in getting accepted, it left the House of Lords in the same lifeless condition in which it entered. As soon as it reached the House of Commons, Mr. Bradlaugh fastened on it at once. It was true that he had got there his own Bill, but Mr. Bradlaugh is a master of parliamentary tactics inferior, if to any, only to Mr. Gladstone. He at once perceived that the supreme struggle was to be no more between one scheme and another, between territorial electorates or Local Boards but that every nerve would have to be strained and every resource husbanded to obtain in the first place recognition of the elective principle. That secured, everything else would follow in its own good time. With a masterly comprehension of the situation, he placed before the House amendments to the Bill, directed to substitute the process of election for that of nomination. The Bill and the Amendments have, however, all gone the way of the majority and the Session closed without the opportunity of discussing them. Profiting, however, by the lessons in which the experience of the last

twelve months was prolific both without and within the walls of Parliament, Mr. Bradlaugh has hit upon the notable expedient of ploughing with Lord Cross's heifer. He has already introduced a new Bill, based on the same lines as Lord Cross's Bill, but vivifying it by the affirmation of the principle for which we are fighting. That Bill will be laid before you for your consideration. It will be for you to deal with it in your wisdom. However you may decide, of one thing I am certain that you will maintain the character for moderation, sagacity and practical good sense which you have so arduously acquired by your self-sacrificing and noble labours during the five years of the existence of the Congress. It is not for me to anticipate your verdict. But I am sure you will allow me, out of my anxious solicitude for the triumph of the cause we have also earnestly at heart, to state the reasons which to my mind make so imperatively for the acceptance of the new draft in which I cannot but recognize the statesmanlike craft and thorough knowledge of the shifting phases of English politics which Mr. Bradlaugh so eminently possesses and which, as we all earnestly pray, promises to place him at no distant date in the front ranks of politicians in office, as he already is in the front ranks of those not in office.

VICEREGAL OPINIONS ON THE INDIAN COUNCILS BILL.

The old draft, admirably devised in some respects—with many virtues and a few faults—has not proved congenial to the English political mind, averse to new departures, and looking askance at the theoretical air of perfection. The new Bill has, on the other hand, all the elements of success in its favour. Its most striking merit is that it gathers round it the cautious, the carefully weighed and responsible opinions of some of the best Viceroys we have ever had. Lord Northbrook has pronounced in favour of a properly safeguarded application of some mode of election. The righteous sympathies of the Marquis of Ripon are as warmly with us as ever and his great authority weighs on the same side. Still more valuable, as coming from a Viceroy who left only the other day, is the measured and calculated approval which Lord Dufferin

has recorded in a despatch, in referring to which I hope I am not making myself liable to the terrors of the Official Secrets Act. In mentioning Lord Dufferin, I will frankly say that we have not sufficiently recognised the great debt of gratitude which we owe to him in this respect, partly, I believe, through ignorance and partly through misappreciation of the course he adopted to neutralise opposition against the measures he recommended. An unrivalled diplomatist, his wary statesmanship was apt to assume the hues of the craft of which he is so accomplished a master. He sought an occasion when he could launch his proposals without provoking disagreement, endeavouring rather to conciliate it. The epoch-making St. Andrews' Dinner of 1888 offered him the needful opportunity. He knew Scotchmen and their matter-of-fact character, so inimitably delineated by Charles Lamb. He knew, as that charming essayist tells us, that:

surmises, guesses, misgivings, half intuitions, partial illuminations, dim instincts, embryo conceptions had no place in their brain or vocabulary.

He drew before his hosts a vivid and alarming picture of imaginary Congress proposals of

an ideal authoritatively suggested of the creation of a representative body or bodies, in which the official element shall be in a minority, who shall have what is called the power of the purse and who, through this instrumentality, shall be able to bring the British executive into subjection to their will.

But while his excited and valiant hosts rushed off, crying Scotchmen to the rescue, to tilt at windmills, he quietly threw in a sympathetic recognition of our just and legitimate aspirations and proceeded to record a minute in which he substantially packed up the veritable Congress proposals. In this Despatch, Lord Dufferin has briefly described his scheme as a plan for the enlargement of the Provincial Councils, for the enhancement of their status, the multiplication of their functions, the partial introduction into them of the elective principle and the liberalization of their general character as political institutions. At this year's St. Andrews' dinner, Sir Charles Elliott eulogized

Lord Dufferin's speech as epoch-making and fixing the bounds and limits of our demands: 'So far and no further.' We are quite content to go as far; we have never asked to go very much further. We may, therefore, fairly infer from Sir Charles Elliott's speech that he is in accord and sympathy with the main underlying principles of Lord Dufferin's scheme and we can, therefore, congratulate the people of Bengal on their good fortune in possessing a ruler whom we can justly claim to be a true Congresswala at heart. (*Laughter and cries of "Oh ! Oh !"*)

LORD LANSDOWNE AND MACAULAY'S PROPHETIC WORDS

I will not speculate without official sanction on the views of the present Viceroy. But I may permit myself to remind you that it was to Henry, Marquis of Lansdowne, that Macaulay dedicated those speeches, in one of which dipping far into the future, he spoke about the future Government of India in that noble passage with which we are all familiar:

The destinies of our Indian Empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fate reserved for a State which resembles no other in history and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that having become instructed in European knowledge they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens would indeed be a title to glory all our own.

The dawn of that day which Macaulay foresaw in dim but prophetic vision, is now breaking on the horizon; the curtain is rising on the drama which unfolds the vista to that title to glory. Let us earnestly hope that the present illustrious bearer of the great historic name of Lansdowne who, by a wonderful ordering of events, has now come to rule over us, may watch the glowing streaks

of light with generous sympathy and may preside over the march of events with timely and provident statesmanship. (*Loud cheers.*)

GLADSTONE'S OPINION ON THE INDIAN COUNCILS BILL

This weighty consensus of the best Viceregal opinion which I have placed before you, in favour of the principle of the new draft, we may expect to be backed up by the potent voice of that Grand Old Man whom we reverence, not only as the greatest parliamentary leader of modern times but as the individual embodiment of the highest conception of moral and political duty which English statesmanship has reached in the 19th century. You are aware that Mr. Bradlaugh has recently declared that he was authorized to say that the course pursued by him in reference to the Government Bill, in endeavouring to obtain a recognition of the elective principle, was approved by Mr. Gladstone who intended to have supported him by speech. It would require considerations of overpowering force, indeed, to persuade us to any course by which we might run the risk of losing such an almost certain pledge of ultimate victory. (*Cheers.*)

WORK OF INDIAN DELEGATES IN ENGLAND

Another potent factor has come into existence within this year, which is calculated to help us materially—if we confine our efforts to the simple issue of election *versus* nomination—in the force of English public opinion which without undertaking to pronounce on questions of detail, has now declared itself to a very considerable extent emphatically in favour of the vital principle of election. The credit of informing the English mind and stirring the English conscience on this momentous question belongs to that small band of noble workers who were appointed at the last Congress to plead the cause of India before the great English people in their own country and who cheerfully crossed the seas in obedience to such a call of duty, without counting the inevitable cost and sacrifice. The task which they undertook was a formidable one; they have discharged it in a manner of which it is difficult to

speak too highly. Of the leader of that band I cannot trust myself to speak with sober moderation, when I remember that it is to his genius we owe that flash of light which pointed out the creation of a body like the Congress, as fraught with the promotion of the best interests of English rule in India. I know there are numerous claimants for the credit of the idea, but if I may be pardoned for employing the rudely forcible language of Carlyle:

The firepan, the kindling, the bitumen were his own; but the lumber of rags, old wood and nameless combustible rubbish (for all is fuel to him) was gathered from hucksters and of every description under Heaven. Whereby indeed hucksters enough have been heard to exclaim: Out upon it, the fire is *mine*.

He brought to bear upon his new enterprise the same zeal and fervour combined with thoughtful judgment that he has unsparingly bestowed for so many years upon the cause to which he has devoted his life. His presence on the Congress Deputation entailed a further sacrifice and affliction, for which we can offer no consolation or reparation except our deepest and most respectful sympathy. In his great and noble mission, Mr. Hume (*loud cheers*) had the entire co-operation of a man of no ordinary powers and capacity. The rare and unrivalled power of oratory which we have learned to admire in Mr. Surendranath Banerjea (*cheers*)—for it is of him I speak—never shone with more brilliant effect than when he was pleading the cause of his countrymen at the bar of the English people, with a fire and energy that exhorted universal respect and admiration. They had a powerful co-adjutor in my friend Mr. Eardley Norton, who has known so well how to make *splendid* use of the heritage of great thoughts and noble deeds which he received from his distinguished father. Mr. Mudholkar from the Central Provinces did yeoman service in the same cause, and his sober and thoughtful eloquence did not carry less weight than that of his brilliant colleagues. There is no need for me to say anything of the services of Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and our other friends in England. But I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without grateful acknowledgment of the

unceasing toil, the prodigious energy and the organizing capacity contributed by Mr. William Digby. The delegates assembled here might render no inconsiderable service to our cause if they exert themselves to stimulate by thousands and tens of thousands the circulation of the Congress paper entitled *India*, started under the auspices of our British Committee and conducted with such marked ability by him and which has done and promises to do, more and more, such incalculable benefit to the object we have at heart. The result of the English campaign clearly shows the wisdom of the new plan of operation suggested by Mr. Bradlaugh. It seems to me that success is well within our reach, if we resolutely apply ourselves to obtain in the first instance at least, the recognition and application of the principle of election in the organization of our Legislative Councils. Let us then strive for it with the sagacity of practical men who have not learnt in vain the lessons taught by English political history and who know the value of moderate, gradual and substantial gain.

INDIAN BUDGET IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

To the many reasons which have been set forth in Congress after Congress, proving the imperative need of reformed Councils, another has been now added. The discussion of the Indian Budget in the House of Commons was always more or less of a sham, but it was a sham for which the officials of the India Office thought it at least a matter of decency to shed a tear of remorse. But now Sir John Gorst has boldly and candidly declared in his place in the House that there need be no sham regret at all; that if anything, it was rather to be hoped and wished for, that the House of Commons should not waste its time over the weary farce. (*Shame, shame*) It is now officially declared that it is right and proper that Parliament should—to use Mr. Yule's happy way of putting it—throw “the great and solemn trust of an inscrutable Providence” back into the hands of Providence to be looked after as Providence itself thinks best with such grace as Providence may choose to pour on the heads of Sir John Gorst, his heirs, successors and assignees. I think you will agree

with me that when the responsible advisers of the Crown on Indian matters propound doctrines of such a character, it is high time that we should raise our united voice to demand Local Councils possessing some guarantees for energy and efficiency. (*Cheers.*)

CONGRESS VOICE : A CRY IN THE WILDERNESS ?

It has been said that our united voice is the voice only of a certain portion of the people and not of the masses, and that it is even then the voice of indifference and not of urgency and excitement. These remarks are intended to be cast as matters of reproach against the Congress ; properly understood they constitute its chief glory. If the masses were capable of giving articulate expression to definite political demands, then the time would have arrived, not for consultative Councils but for representative institutions. It is because they are still unable to do so that the function and the duty devolve upon their educated and enlightened compatriots to feel, to understand and to interpret their grievances and requirements, and to suggest and indicate how these can best be repressed and met. History teaches us that such has been the law of widening progress in all ages and all countries, notably in England itself. That function and that duty which thus devolve upon us, is best discharged, not in times of alarm and uneasiness, of anger and excitement but when the heart is loyal and clear and reason unclouded. It is, I repeat, the glory of the Congress that the educated and enlightened people of the country seek to repay the debt of gratitude, which they owe for the priceless boon of education, by pleading and pleading temperately for timely and provident statesmanship. (*Cheers.*)

FAITH IN ENGLAND

I have no fears but that the English statesmanship will ultimately respond to the call. I have unbounded faith in the living and fertilizing principles of English culture and English civilizations. It may be that, at times, the prospect may look dark and gloomy. Anglo-Indian opposition may look fierce and uncompromising. But my faith is large, even in Anglo-Indians. As in the whole universe, so in

individuals, in communities, there is a perpetual conflict going on between the higher and lower passions and impulses of our nature. Perhaps some of you have read a little novel called Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, the plot of which hinges on the conflict between the two sides of a man's nature, the higher and the lower, embodied, each for the time being, in a separate and distinct individuality. If the lower tendencies are sometimes paramount in the Hydes of Anglo-Indian Society, if as our last President Sir W. Wedderburn said, the interests of the services are antagonistic to and prevail over the interests of the Indian people, it is still the oscillation of the struggle; it is still only one side of the shield. They cannot permanently divest themselves of the higher and nobler nature which, in the end, must prevail and which has prevailed in so many honorable, distinguished and illustrious instances. They are after all a part and parcel of the great English nation, bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh, and they must even work along the main lines of that noble policy which Great Britain has deliberately adopted for the government of this country. When, in the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, India was assigned to the care of England, one can almost imagine that the choice was offered to her as to Israel of old :

Behold I have placed before you a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye will obey the commandments of the Lord your God; a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God but go after other gods whom ye have not known.

All the great forces of English life and society, moral, social, intellectual, political, are if slowly, yet steadily and irresistibly, declaring themselves for the choice which will make the connection of England and India a blessing to themselves and to the whole world for countless generations. Our Congress asks but to serve as a modest handmaid to that movement, asks but to be allowed to show the pits and the falls, asks but to be allowed to join in the blessing which England will as surely earn as there is an "Eternal that maketh for righteousness".
(Cheers.)

SIR CHARLES DILKE ON THE CONGRESS

I appeal to all true Englishmen—to candid friends as well as to generous foes—not to let this prayer go in vain. It may be that we sometimes speak in uncouth and outlandish ways, it may be that we sometimes stray in some confusion of thought and language; still it is the prayer of a rising, growing and hopeful nation. I will appeal to them to listen to the sage counsels of one of the most careful and observant of their modern politicians who, like the prophet Balaam called, I will not say, exactly to curse us, has, however, blessed us utterly. In his "Problems of Greater Britain," Sir Charles Dilke thus sums up his views on the Congress:

Argument upon the matter is to be desired but not invective, and there is so much reason to think the Congress movement really represents the cultivated intelligence of the country, that those who ridicule it do harm to the Imperial interest of Great Britain, bitterly wounding and alienating men who are justified in what they do, who do it in reasonable and cautious form and who ought to be conciliated by being met half way. (*Cheers*) The official class themselves admit that many of the natives who attack the Congress do so to ingratiate themselves with their British rulers and to push their claims for decorations. (*Hear, hear*) Our first duty in India is that of defending the country against anarchy and invasion, but our other greatest duty is to learn how to live with what is commonly called the Congress movement, namely, with the development of that new India which we have ourselves created. Our past work in India has been a splendid task, splendidly performed, but there is a still nobler one before us and one larger even than that labour on the Irish problem to which our public men on both sides seem too much inclined to give their whole attention.

So careful an estimate of the work and spirit of the Congress movement cannot but commend itself to all thoughtful minds.

However that may be, our duty lies clear before us to go on with our work firmly and fearlessly but with moderation and, above all, with humility. If we might be

permitted to adopt those noble words of Cardinal Newman,
we may say :

Lead, kindly light, amid the encircling gloom,
Lead thou me on !

The night is dark and I am far from home,
Lead thou me on !

Keep thou my feet, I do not ask to see,
The distant path, one step's enough for me. (*Cheers.*)

MR. P. ANANDA CHARLU

FRIENDS and Fellow-Citizens,—I thank you most warmly for making me take the Presidential Chair on this occasion. That chair has narrowly missed a far higher honour than I can do to it, owing to two unforeseen occurrences. One of these occurrences is, that the Hon'ble Pundit Ajoodhia Nath is unfortunately, for both you and me, not a Madrasi. Were it not that he generously abdicated the dignity in favour of Madras, I should gladly have avoided the danger of accepting a situation that would draw me into comparison with that unselfish, whole-hearted, intrepid and outspoken apostle of this great national movement. (*Cheers.*) But in this world of imperfections and of complex considerations, duty does not always fall on the fittest shoulders and there is the additional reason that the unanimous mandate of the country compels my obedience.

The second occurrence I allude to as the cause of my standing here to-day is, that my friend Dewan Bahadur Subramaniya Iyer has been raised to a seat on the High Court Bench of Madras. At the first blush, this may seem a matter for regret; but from the point of view from which I regard it, it affords reason for congratulation rather than for regret and that even *so far as the Congress is concerned*; or does it not give us another and eloquent proof that, where other merits exist, active service in the cause of the public does, by no means, clash with the equally honourable ambition of obtaining high office as a public servant. Mr. Subramaniya Iyer's is the rare case of one who had not deliberately stood aloof from all public movements, with the possible prospect of entering Government service and who, allured away

from the call of public duty by the first instalment of Government patronage, returned to that duty, as cheerfully and as actively as before and who has been nevertheless again selected to fill a high place in the official hierarchy of this country. With a scrupulous regard for the demands of both the vocations, he took particular care that neither suffered by reason of the other, or on account of the other. Therefore, I assure you that, without meaning that I hope adequately to fill his place as the President of this great National Assembly, it should be a matter of rejoicing to the Congress that another of its prominent workers should have been elevated to the most dignified office, as yet open to indigenous talent under the British administration of this country.

TRIBUTE TO THE DEAD

These personal considerations remind me of the loss—the irreparable loss—which the Congress has sustained, since its last sitting, by the lamented death of Mr. Charles Bradlaugh. He was the redoubtable champion who brought within the domain of practical politics one of the foremost subjects in the Congress programme. Till Mr. Bradlaugh, who may without exaggeration be described as an embodiment of universal benevolence, befriended our cause with his characteristic unselfishness, all our pathetic appeals for a forward step in the direction of reforming our Legislative Councils remained a veritable cry in the wilderness; and the fact that, upon his death, even Lord Cross's halting measure was dropped, puts this beyond all doubt.

It is a matter for deep sorrow that Mr. Charles Bradlaugh's useful career was cut short before he could redeem even his guarded promise to us, that he hoped to carve and shape a step or two in the uphill work that lay in front of us—a work of such magnitude and importance as to make him weigh most scrupulously the words he used. There is little prospect of any one man proving to us the tower of strength that he unquestionably was, during the short time that we had the benefit of his lively sympathy and unremitting effort. We have, indeed

been slow to erect a memorial suited to his great merits and his unpurchased services in our cause; and our unfriendly critics have not been slow to make capital out of this seeming apathy. In the Presidency from which I come, famine and its attendant evils are, within my personal knowledge, chiefly answerable for this seeming remissness in the fulfilment of our duty—a duty which, as we view it, consists in a recognition of the work of that unflinching advocate of the people's rights, not merely by the moneyed few but also by that far larger class to which he belonged and of which he was proud to declare that he reckoned himself as one. Our monsoons, Gentlemen, have begun to give signs of improvement, though after a very long delay. May this improved state of things bring in thousands of small contributions which, tiny like the rain drops individually, may in the aggregate fill to overflowing the coffers of the many Bradlaugh Committees in the land. I have little doubt that this earnest appeal will meet with a ready, wide and adequate response before many months are over.

I shall next invite you, brethren, to join me in paying a similar loving, though mournful, tribute to the memories of two distinguished men who had figured as the chairmen of Congress Reception Committees and of whom death has robbed us since our last session—Raja Sir T. Madhava Rao, K.C.S.I., and Dr. Rajendra Lala Mitra, the latter of whom is, I think, better described and wider known under that title which is a tribute to his profound scholarship and varied learning, than by the distinctions of Rai Bahadur and of Rajah—distinctions which came to him too late to add any lustre to his already brilliant fame. Our sincere gratitude is due to them for the eloquent exposition of the views of the Congress Party which their speeches as Chairmen embodied and for the prominent part they took in the sittings of the Congress which they so heartily ushered in.

MR. A. O. HUME'S SERVICES TO INDIA

One more sincere friend of India, happily living and breathing in our midst and meriting our warmest

acknowledgment, remains yet to be named—our General Secretary, Mr. A. O. Hume. (*Cheers*) Through good report and through evil report and at the sacrifice of health, money, well-earned ease, and peace of mind, he has steadily and earnestly adhered to his labour of love in the progressive interests of the people of this country, and he has thus earned not only our love and gratitude, but I hope also the love and gratitude of our children and children's children. (*Loud cheers.*)

He has recently given us warning that he contemplates an early retirement from his Indian field of labour—a retirement which involves the resignation of his office as the General Secretary of the Indian National Congress. This, we must confess, has come upon us as a surprise, though we had no business to be unprepared for it. This unpreparedness is in the main traceable to the habits generated in us by the monopolising character of British Indian rule which, taking upon itself all the solitudes and almost all the responsibilities of the administration of the country, has given but little occasion for the development in us of the capacities and aptitude necessary for facing with confidence a sudden emergency. If this were the second or third session of the Congress, I should despond and shudder at the inevitable consequences. But thanks to his indefatigable exertions and his prophetic sagacity, he has coupled his warning with the inspiring assurance that one great work of the Congress has been accomplished; that its programme has been built up and promulgated; that the present seventh session is needed, not so much to discuss new subjects as to put the seal on all that its predecessors have done; and that it completes one distinct stage of our progress.

WHAT MR. A. O. HUME SAYS

These are, without doubt, noble and encouraging words, and every syllable of them deserves our earnest attention. Let us look back on our career. What was our task at starting? In the words of our General Secretary: a great work had to be done—we had to clear our own ideas and then make them clear to our opponents;—to thresh out by

persistent discussion the wheat of our aspirations from the great body of chaff that must, in the very nature of things, have accompanied it. We had to find out exactly what those reforms were which the country, as a whole, most desired; we had to evolve and formulate a clear and succinct programme—to erect a standard around which, now and for all time, until that programme is realized, all reformers and well-wishers of India could gather; and we had to place that programme on record in such a form that neither foreign autocrats nor domestic traitors could efface its pregnant lines,

or read into those lines a meaning that they were not intended to convey.

EARLY YEARS OF THE CONGRESS

Now, let us note how we were a mere handful, numbering less than four score when we started on our national mission; how at that moment it was little more than an untried, though cherished, idea that we should strive to mitigate, if not eradicate, race-prejudices, to disarm creed-antipathies and to remove provincial jealousies, and how, by that achievement as a means towards an end, we wished to develop and consolidate sentiments of national unity. Let us next note that when, under the impulse then given to our renovated national instincts, we met next year in Calcutta that ripe scholar and sober antiquarian, Dr. Rajendra Lala Mitra, declared that he saw in the assembly before him the commencement of the realisation of the dream of his life, *viz*, to witness the scattered units of his race come together, coalesce and stand welded into one nation. Then came our session in Madras and there we succeeded in blotting out the stigma that one part of our country was “benighted”, and we exhibited the spectacle of a gathering, more considerable in numbers, more representative in composition, more adequate in the proportion of the Muhammadan contingent, more cordial in feeling, more in unison with the name of this institution, wider in basis and altogether a nearer approximation than had till then been attained to the conception of a nationality in that sense in which alone that word has a meaning in political parlance. On the impregnable basis which that gathering illustrated, the

subsequent sessions of the Congress were constituted, and our success has been great and signal.

IS THE CONGRESS NOT "NATIONAL" ?

To detract from the worth and significance of the well-knit, ever-expanding phalanx known as the Indian National Congress, a desultory controversy was raised round the word *nationality*—a controversy at once learned and unlearned, ingenious and stupid, etymological and ethnological. Now a common religion was put forward as the *differentia*; now a common language; now a proved or provable common extraction; and now the presence of the privileges of commensality and inter-conjugal kinship. These ill-considered and ill-intentioned hypotheses have, one and all, fallen to the ground, and no wonder for the evident circumstance was lost sight of, that words might have divers acceptations—each most appropriate for one purpose, and, in a like degree, inappropriate for other purposes. In my view the word *nationality* should be taken to have the same meaning as the Sanskrit *Prajah*, which is the correlative of the term *Rajah*—the ruling power. Though like the term *Prajah*, it may have various significations, it has but one obvious, unmistakable meaning in political language, *viz.*, the aggregate of those that are (to adapt and adopt the words of a writer in the *National Review*)—

citizens of one country, subordinate to one power, subject to one supreme Legislature, taxed by one authority, influenced for weal or woe, by one system of administration, urged by like impulses to secure like rights and to be relieved of like burdens.

It is in reality a potential class. In the first place, it has for its central stock—like the trunk of a tree—the people who have for ages and generations settled and domiciled in a country, with more or less ethnic identity at bottom and more or less unified by being continually subjected to identical environments and to the inevitable process of assimilation. In the next place it gets added to, from time to time, by the accession of other peoples—like acions engrafted on the central stem, or like creepers attaching thereto—who settle in the country in a like

manner, and come under the many unifying influences already referred to, though *still* exhibiting marks of separateness and distinctness. Affirm this standard and you have an Indian nation. Deny it and you have a nation *nowhere* on the face of the earth. (*Cheers.*)

TESTS OF NATIONALITY

A common language, a common religion, inter-dining, and inter-marriage are, without doubt, potent auxiliaries. These help, no doubt, by affording facilities for co-operation and by rendering easy the attainment of common objects. But, for all that, they are at best inseparable accidents, and it betrays a grievous obliquity of judgment to esteem them as constituting the very essence of what is understood by the term *nation*. We began, proceeded and have persevered up to this day on the tacit assumption that such is the correct doctrine, and let us continue to exert ourselves on that principle at least as a working definition; because, by pursuing such a course, and within the short period of seven years, we have accomplished *the great and palpable fact* that the Hindu and Mahomedan populations of this country—long separated from one another—long divided by parochial differences—long kept apart and estranged from one another by sectional and sectarian jealousies—have at last recognised one another as members of a single brotherhood, despite the many differences that still linger. This is a magnificent product of the Congress as a *mighty nationaliser*. The part it has already played in this direction is, indeed, glorious, and I am sure you will not charge me with holding Utopian views if on the basis of what has been achieved and in view to the vital interests involved, I venture to predict that through the agency of the Congress far more intimate relations, and far closer forms of kinship are in store for us in the not remote future.

CONGRESS ACHIEVEMENTS

If this, brethren, is the subjective benefit we as the members of the Congress have secured, what have we to show as its objective results? I need not accumulate facts to make this clear. Let us first recall to our minds that

when we met at Bombay in the first year of our existence, we were referred to by the then head of the Indian Government only as an influential and intelligent body. Let us next remember that, when last year we assembled in the capital of this Empire, the present head of the Indian Government stamped and labelled us as an *established constitutional party*, carrying on a *legitimate* work with *legitimate* instruments and according to *acknowledged* methods. This is much for an Indian Viceroy to accept, though it is open to doubt whether we have received all our due, and whether we do not, correctly speaking, correspond to a more numerous, more influential and more favoured party in England. Not only was there the change of opinion about ourselves, but there has been a distinct step taken by the authorities on the lines we have chalked out for reform. What was Lord Cross's India Bill but a confirmation of our views and a response—though a faltering response—to our chorus voice. May we not also justly take credit for the labours (such as they were) of the Public Service Commission and the consequent raising of age for candidates to the Indian Covenanted Service, the inauguration of the policy of a larger recruitment of the Uncovenanted Service from the natives of this country, the creation of a Legislative Council for the N.-W. Provinces, and a *marked improvement* in the class or quality of members selected for all the Legislative Councils in the country ever since. These are unmistakable evidences of our objective achievements, and I think, Gentlemen, they are such as we may well be proud of.

MR. YULE'S VIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL

But, notwithstanding all these grounds for congratulating ourselves, the lamentable fact remains that *in regard to our higher claims*, little beyond lip-concession in this country, and a half-hearted and halting measure (now shelved) in the Imperial metropolis, has as yet fallen to our lot. We may work ever so long in this country, the prospect does not seem to brighten; and the real cause

may chiefly be that, "the Government in India has no power; the Council in London has no power; the House of Commons *has* the power, but it refuses or neglects to exercise it", as Mr. Yule asserted from his place as the President of our Session at Allahabad.

There is no doubt that Mr. Yule's last disjunctive sentence means more than he wished to convey. Nor did he intend all that is signified by his statement that six hundred and fifty odd members, who are bound to be the guardians and protectors of India's rights and liberties have thrown the great and solemn trust of an inscrutable Providence back upon the hands of Providence to be looked after as Providence itself thought best. Mr. Yule himself made this clear when he virtually told us almost immediately after that the members of the House of Commons had not time enough, and information enough, on the questions that came up before them to be able to judge rightly.

EDUCATE THE BRITISH PUBLIC

What then is the remedy? On whom is it incumbent to seek and secure the remedy? The answer has been given that the remedy lies in instructing the British public and in raising their level of information regarding Indian affairs to the standard of usefulness. The further answer has been given that the duty of seeking and securing that remedy lies primarily on ourselves, secondarily, on the British voting and thought-leading public, and finally, on their accredited representatives who constitute the House of Commons. In partial discharge of these duties we have maintained the British Congress Committee, composed of earnest and generous souls working gratuitously for us, with a talented Secretary in Mr. Digby, whose well-informed, timely and earnest efforts in our behalf are the admiration of our friends and a thorn in the ribs of those of our foes, who endeavour to gain a point by deluding an uneducated public with false and ill-founded representations. No words of mine are necessary to bring home to you the fact that a more capable, self-denying, and benevolent body of men never put their

shoulders to a philanthropic work in our interests, and that a larger measure of success was never achieved than was accomplished by them, with their circumscribed opportunities and with many other demands on their time and attention. There are abundant signs that their numbers will increase, and that the sphere of their influence and usefulness will widen, provided we do, as I shall presently show, what is expected of us. A second agency, which has come into being and which is entirely due to British generosity, is the Indian Party formed in the House of Commons itself. Mr. Charles Bradlaugh was its brilliant centre-piece and since death filched that priceless jewel from us, the setting has remained with the socket still to be filled in. Here, again, it depends on ourselves whether that gap is to be adequately filled, and that body is to receive in the requisite measure accession of strength in numbers and influence; or whether we are to be thrown back a quarter of a century, and find ourselves in the pre-Bradlaugh, pre-Congress, and pre-Ripon days of apathy, obscurity and inert resignation. (*No, no.*)

A CONGRESS IN LONDON

The anxious and well-considered advice of the British Congress Committee, and the mature opinion of the members of the Parliamentary Indian Party, concur in urging us to change the *venue*—to transfer our operations to London itself. Members of our body who have already rendered yeoman service in England as our delegates before the British public, are of the same mind. Any doubt that may still linger must be dispelled by the fact that, although Lord Dufferin, as the head of the Indian Government, urged the wisdom and desirability of adopting some form of the elective principle in the constitution of our Legislative Councils, his recommendation, based—be it noted—on his personal grasp of local conditions, has been burked; and that even the makeshift of a limping substitute for it, in the shape of Lord Cross's India Bill, has been shelved and pigeon-holed no one knows for how long, no one can tell with what motives. In the face of such a fate having overtaken the suggestions

of the most cautious, diplomatic, and wary Viceroy we have had, can we expect that either the present Viceroy, albeit he has put his seal of approval on us as a constitutional party, or any of his successors, will so far *discount their self-respect* as to court a similar summary and unceremonious treatment of their proposals! It seems to me that the cumulative force of all these considerations points unmistakably to the absolute necessity of translating ourselves to London with the Congress banner over our heads, emblazoned with the figure of the Union Jack, as much for indicating our aims and objects as for fanning away from the delegates, assembled under its shade, all the noxious exaltations from those foul mouths which impute to us seditious intentions and anti-English proclivities—as if, forsooth, the leaders of the Congress, who are the outcome of the British rule and whose very existence depends on the maintenance of the British power in India, could be so irrational as to adopt the suicidal policy of lopping off the very branch on which they stand.

This momentous step of holding a meeting in London we can neither avoid nor postpone; and I entreat you to resolve it earnestly in your minds, and to resolve right manfully to do what you finally find to be your plain duty. In regard to this step, I do not say that there are not serious difficulties to overcome. One great barrier—the dreaded social ostracism—is not to be got rid of by mere rhetorical outbursts. The question deserves our most serious consideration.

It has to be soberly and dispassionately noted whether the restrictions as to the countries we could visit were not more stringent by far in the earliest times than ever after; whether many regions originally tabooed in express terms in the Smrithis, were not in later days tacitly taken out of the category of forbidden land for an Aryan to enter; whether, in so far as a sea voyage is concerned, a distinction has not been drawn between the north and the south of India on the ground of custom; and whether, where the custom had existed, it was not allowed to be unobjection-

able and perfectly compatible with being within the pale of Hinduism; and whether, lastly, and above all, there is not ground for the conclusion that the stringency of the rules in the Smritis has been authoritatively declared to admit of relaxation in so far as the Grihastha is concerned though not in the case of those who, vowing to consecrate themselves to a life of piety, practically release themselves from social and political duties and obligations, and are therefore denied the immunities held out to those who labour for and in such society.

If we decide in the affirmative, infinite will be our credit. If in so deciding it we are forsaken by our kith and kin, it will still be considerably to our credit that we have made a heroic sacrifice for the sake of our country and in the interests of those very kith and kin who may be so cruel as to cast us off. But such social persecution and banishment cannot continue for ever. Our cause is so just and righteous, our principles and methods of action so loyal and upright, our opportunities of doing good so many and varied, that in the long run even our worst enemies will learn to find in us their best friends, and such of our kinsmen as estrange themselves from us will, I believe, gladly associate with us again and restore to us the social privileges that they temporarily withhold from us. Such is my belief, judging from precedent in other, yet analogous, departures. But if the worst should happen, there is already the beginning of a Congress-caste fundamentally based on Hinduism and substantially in accord with its dictates, and such a visitation as a determined social banishment lasting for any length of time would only tend to cement that caste more closely together and to greater purpose. Thus would it be possible to form the nucleus of a daily multiplying and expansive fraternity, and it would soon be seen at large that by social union with it there is much to gain in matters mundane and little to lose in interests truly spiritual.

PROBABLE RESULTS OF A LONDON SESSION

Should we succeed in holding a session in London, and thereby secure seats for elected members in our

Legislative Councils, that in itself would give us much indirect help in pushing on internal reform. A decent interment of rather moribund laws, virtually dead but lingering only to thwart, and the introduction of fresh laws to give an impulse to the betterment of our social condition, are now hopeless impossibilities. The Government fight shy of them, and nominated members who take their clue from that Government are equally timorous. If, however, this quiescence is departed from in any instance under the existing system, the Government and the members that lead themselves to the departure at once fall victims to calumnious abuse and unpopularity; for it is quite possible for a minority to raise a powerful cry and give it the character of a popular outburst of indignation. As matters stand, no means exist for gauging the popular feeling for or against the measure. Newspapers have too often given an uncertain sound, and Commissions to take evidence cannot sit long enough, and examine a large enough number of witnesses, to be sure that a correct conclusion has been reached. If, as we propose, elected members should have seats among our legislators, the problem would be fairly solved. Men seeking election would find it necessary to present themselves with such proposals as in their view might be acceptable to the popular mind, and the fact of their being elected or rejected would in many cases afford conclusive proof, whether the legislation proposed was well-timed or not, in harmony with popular feeling or at variance with it. Should any dispute arise as to whether a legislative measure proposed is popular or otherwise, the member in charge of it, and members in favour of it, might resign their seats and seek re-election on that very measure, while the Government, not identifying itself with the measure, would without incurring any odium be able to allow useful legislation to go on or to be tried, respecting matters which its solicitude, not to be misunderstood and not to incur unpopularity, might make it avoid.

EDUCATE THE MASSES

Whatever may be our decision as to the duty of sending a gallant contingent to London to make up the

session of the Congress there, it is undoubtedly imperative on us to penetrate to the masses here more than hitherto, and deeply imbue them with the spirit of the Congress, which is only another name for national sentiment. (*Cheers.*) The impression is still prevalent that as yet the effect of our efforts in this direction has been only slight, and we have done little more than to scratch the outer skin and to awaken the spasmodic enthusiasm of our un-anglicised brethren. Let us approach them with all the energy and fervour that we have hitherto brought to the Congress platform, but which energy and fervour—so far as the Indian field is concerned—will not on the present scale be necessary for that purpose in future quite apart from the question whether we should close our Congress labours in India for a time.

Whether we resolve to rest on our oars or not, it becomes our bounden duty all the same to go more amid the masses and to saturate their minds with the aspirations of a united nationality. There is another *very solid reason* for such effort. It involves the fulfilment of a trust; for constituting the upper strata of the Indian society, we have first caught the light of the enlightened West—as mountain tops catch the first glimpses of the rising sun. But, unlike those glimpses, that light will not descend to the lower strata of our society unless we actively transmit it from a sense of duty and a sense of honor.

Let us impart to our people, as we are in righteousness bound to do, our conviction that they should cease to look upon the British rule as the rule of a foreign people. We should ask them to look upon our British rulers as filling a gap that has existed in our national economy—as taking the place once held by the Kshatria, and as being therefore part and parcel of the traditional administrative mechanism of the land.

Let us not heed the sinister cry that we shall thereby drag the people of this country into discussing politics—into paths they are supposed never before to have trodden. For our part we shall only act up to the

undoubted right involved in the fact that we are England's subjects; and, as regards our countrymen at large, they will only be brought back to those privileges, which—unquestioned by authority and with the full knowledge of authority—our ancestors are recorded to have enjoyed in their Samsaths, Sabhas and Ootwaras in the days treated of in that grand old epic the Mahabharata.

CONCLUSION

Gentlemen, I am deeply thankful to you for the patient and indulgent attention you have accorded to me. Our British rulers have indeed withheld from us the privilege of demonstrating our love and loyalty towards our Sovereign Lady, the Empress Queen, by fighting her battles as volunteers under the British flag, but we have still some consolation left in the fact that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than those of war". The Congress platform is the field on which such bloodless triumphs are to be won, and though as yet we have had but a small measure of success, there is ground for hope in what the poet sings :

What freedom's battle once begun,

.

Though baffled oft, is ever won.

We, as the pioneers of the movement, may attain little more than the satisfaction of upholding what is right and protesting against what is wrong; but succeeding generations will reap the fruit of our labours and will cherish with fond remembrance the names of those who had the courage and the humanity, the singleness of purpose and the self-sacrificing devotion to duty, to work for the benefit of posterity in spite of calumny and persecution and great personal loss. Men such as these may attain no titles of distinction from Government, but they are "nobles by the right of an earlier creation". They may fail to win honour from their contemporaries as the truest apostles, but they are "priests by the imposition of a mightier hand"

and, when their life's work is done, they will have that highest of all earthly rewards—the sense of having left their country better than they had found it—the glory of having built up into a united and compact nation the divers races and classes of the Indian population, and the satisfaction of having led a people sunk in political and social torpor to think and act for themselves, and strive to work out their own well-being by constitutional and righteous methods. (*Loud and continued cheers.*)

Eighth Congress—Allahabad—1892

MR. W. C. BONNERJEE

INTRODUCTION

BROTHER DELEGATES, Ladies and Gentlemen,—
The position, which by your unanimous voice you have called me to fill, is a most distinguished and honourable one. I am proud to fill it, and I trust that with your help and by your forbearance, I may be able to discharge the duties which will be required of me as the President of the Eighth Indian National Congress adequately and satisfactorily. (*Cheers.*) Those duties, as all of you who have attended our Congresses before know, are heavy and onerous in the extreme, and I appeal to you to deal out to me, in the same spirit in which you dealt out to my predecessors, such help and indulgence as may be needed by me.

A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE CONGRESS WORK DONE

You have been reminded that I have the honour to be the person who inaugurated the Congress movement in Bombay in the year 1885, as its first President. It is singular coincidence that the Bombay meeting was held on this very day, the 28th of December. The first cycle of our existence thus commenced on the 28th December, under my humble presidency, and ended with the presidency of my friend Mr. Ananda Charlu, who so kindly proposed my election. The second cycle begins on the same day seven years afterwards, again under my humble presidency. At the first Congress there were only a few of us assembled together, but as I pointed out at the time, there were various causes which prevented a larger muster.

These, however, who assembled there on that occasion, were animated by a sincere desire to make the movement a success and fully determined that it should be so if hard work could effect it. And I appeal to those assembled here to-day to say whether that movement has been a success or not. (*Applause.*) Year after year we have met, each meeting vying with its predecessor in the number of delegates attending it, in the sacrifices which the delegates made to attend it, in the energy, zeal and determination with which the business was passed through, and the moderation which throughout characterised the proceedings before the Congress. There can be no doubt—say what those who do not view our proceedings with friendly eyes may—that the Congress movement has been a success and a conspicuous success. The persons to whom I have referred have been troubling their brains from almost the very commencement of the movement to find out how it is that this movement, which they are pleased to call only a “native” movement, has been such a success. And they have hit upon one of the causes, which they have iterated and reiterated, in season and out of season, as the cause of the success of the Congress, namely, the influence over us of that great man Allan Octavian Hume. (*Loud and prolonged cheers.*) That Mr. Hume possesses and has exercised a vast amount of influence over the Congress movement, and over each single Congress which has met, is a fact. We are not only not ashamed to acknowledge it, but we acknowledge it with gratitude to that Gentleman, and we are proud of his connection with the Congress. (*Cheers.*) But the movement is only to some extent, and I may say, only a limited extent, due to the influence which Mr. Hume has exercised over us. It is not the influence of this man or of that man or of any third man that has made the Congress what it is. It is the British professors who have discoursed eloquently to us on the glorious constitution of their country; it is the British merchants who have shown to us how well to deal with the commodities of our country; it is the British engineers who have annihilated distance and enabled us to come together for our deliberation from all

parts of the empire ; it is the British planters who have shown us how best to raise the products of our soil ; it is all these, in other words, it is all the influences which emanate from British rule in India that have made the Congress the success it is. (*Cheers.*) The Congress is a mere manifestation of the good work that has been done by all those to whom I have referred (and I ought also to have referred to the British Missionaries who have worked amongst us) ; and all that we wish by this movement to do is to ask the British public, both in this country and in Great Britain, that without any strain on the connection which exists between Great Britain and this country, such measures may be adopted by the ruling authorities that the grievances under which we labour may be removed, and that we may hereafter have the same facilities of national life that exist in Great Britain herself. How long it will take us to reach the latter end no one can tell ; but it is our duty to keep the hope of it before us, and keep reminding our British fellow-subjects that this hope shall always be with us. (*Cheers.*)

CONGRESS AND SOCIAL REFORM

Some of our critics have been busy in telling us thinking they knew our affairs better than we know them ourselves, that we ought not to meddle with political matters, but leaving politics aside devote ourselves to social subjects and so improve the social system of our country. I am one of those who have very little faith in the public discussion of social matters ; those are things which, I think, ought to be left to the individuals of a community who belong to the same social organisation to do what they can for its improvement. We know how excited people become when social subjects are discussed in public. Not long ago we had an instance of this when what was called the Age of Consent Bill was introduced into the Viceregal Legislative Council. I do not propose to say one word as to the merits of the controversy that arose over that measure, but I allude to it to illustrate how apt the public mind is to get agitated over these social matters if they are discussed in a hostile and unfriendly

spirit in public. But to show to you that those who organised the Congress movement had not lost sight of the question of social reform, I may state that when we met in Bombay for the first time, the matter was discussed threadbare with the help of such distinguished social reformers as Dewan Bahadur Raghunatha Rao of Madras, Mr. Mahadev Govind Ranade, and Mr. Krishnaji Lakshman Nulkar of Poona, Mr. Norendra Nath Sen, and Mr. Janakinath Ghosal of Calcutta and others. The whole subject was considered from every point of view, and we at last came to the conclusion with the full consent and concurrence of those distinguished men that it would not do for the Congress to meddle itself, as a Congress, with questions of social reform. At the same time we also came to the conclusion that those gentlemen who were anxious in a friendly spirit to discuss their own social organizations should have an opportunity of doing so in the Congress hall after the business of the Congress should be over. The principal reason which actuated us in coming to that conclusion was that at our gatherings there would attend delegates following different religions, living under different social systems, all more or less interwoven with their respective religions, and we felt it would not be possible for them as a body to discuss social matters. How is it possible for a Hindu gentleman to discuss with a Parsi or a Mahomedan gentleman matters connected with Hindu social questions? How is it possible for a Mahomedan gentleman to discuss with Hindu and Parsi gentlemen matters connected with Mahomedan social questions? And how is it possible for a Parsi gentleman to discuss with Hindu and Mahomedan gentlemen matters connected with Parsi social customs? We thought, and I hope you will agree, that we were right that under the circumstances all we could do was to leave it to the Hindus and the Mahomedans, Parsis, and other delegates to discuss their respective social matters in a friendly spirit amongst themselves, and arrive at what conclusions they pleased, and if possible to get the minority to submit to the views of the majority. (*Cheers.*) I may point out that we do not all understand in the same sense what is meant by social

reform. Some of us are anxious that our daughters should have the same education as our sons, that they should go to universities, that they should adopt learned professions; others who are more timid would be content with seeing that their children are not given in marriage when very young, and that child widows should not remain widows all the days of their lives. Others more timid still would allow social problems to solve themselves. It is impossible to get any common ground even as regards the members of the same community, be it Hindu, Mahomedan or Parsi, with respect to these matters. Thus it was that social questions were left out of the Congress programme; thus it was that the Congress commenced and has since remained, and will, I sincerely trust, always remain as a purely political organisation devoting its energies to political matters and political matters only. I am afraid that those whether belonging to our own country or to any other country, who find fault with us for not making social subjects a part of our work, cherish a secret wish that we might all be set by the ears, as we are all set by the ears by the Age of Consent Bill, and that thus we might come to an ignominious end. They mean us no good, and when we find critics of that description talking of the Congress as only fit to discuss social problems, I think the wider the berth we give them, the better. (*Cheers.*)

RELATION BETWEEN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL REFORMS

I, for one, have no patience with those who say we shall not be fit for political reform until we reform our social system. I fail to see any connection between the two. Let me take, for instance, one of the political reforms which we have been suggesting year after year, *viz.*, the separation of judicial from executive functions in the same officer. What possible connection can there be between this, which is a purely political reform and social reform? In the same way, take the Permanent Settlement which we have been advocating, the amendment of the law relating to forests and other such measures;—and I ask again, what have these to do with social reforms? Are we not fit for

them because our widows remain unmarried and our girls are given in marriage earlier than in other countries? because our wives and daughters do not drive about with us visiting our friends? because we do not send our daughters to Oxford or Cambridge? (*Cheers.*)

TRIBUTE TO THE DEAD

It is now my sorrowful duty to officially announce to you that death has been busy amongst the ranks of Congressmen during the year just passed. Standing on this platform and speaking in this city, one feels almost an overpowering sense of despair when one finds that the familiar figure and the beloved face of Pandit Ajudhianath is no more. We mourned for him when he died, we have mourned for him since; and those of us who had the privilege of knowing him intimately, of perceiving his kindly heart, his great energy, his great devotion to the Congress cause, and the sacrifices he made for that cause, will mourn for him to the last. With Pandit Ajudhianath has passed away that other great Congress leader, Mr. George Yule. These were the two most prominent figures in the Congress held in this City in 1888: Pandit Ajudhianath as the Chairman of the Reception Committee; Mr. Yule as the President of the Congress. It was my singular good fortune to have been the means of inducing both these gentlemen to espouse the Congress cause. I was here in April 1887, and met Pandit Ajudhianath, who had not then expressed his views, one way or another, with regard to Congress matters. I discussed the matter with him. He listened to me with his usual courtesy and urbanity, and he pointed out to me certain defects which he thought existed in our system; and at last after a sympathetic hearing of over an hour and a half, he told me he would think of all I had said to him, and that he would consider the matter carefully and thoroughly and then let me know his views. I never heard anything from him from that time until on the eve of my departure for Madras to attend the Congress of 1887. I then received a letter from him in which he said I had made a convert of him to the Congress cause, that he had thoroughly made up his mind to join us, that he

was anxious to go to Madras himself, but that illness prevented him from doing so, and he sent a message that if it pleased the Congress to hold its next session at Allahabad in 1888, he would do all he could to make the Congress a success. And you know—certainly those of you who attended know—what a success he did make of it. Our venerable President of the Reception Committee of this present Congress has told us the difficulties which had to be encountered to make that Congress a success, and I do not belittle his services or those of any other worthy Congressman who worked with him at that Congress when I say that it was owing to Pundit Ajudhianath's exertions that that Congress was the success it was.

When it was time to select a President for recommendation to the Congress of 1888, it was suggested to me, I being then in England, that I might ascertain the views of Mr. George Yule and ask him to preside. I accordingly saw him at his office in the City, and had the same kind of conversation with him as I had the year before with Pandit Ajudhianth. He also listened to me kindly, courteously and sympathetically, and asked me to give him all the Congress literature I had. I had only the three reports of the Congress Meetings of 1885, 1886 and 1887, and I sent these to him; and to my great joy, and as it afterwards turned out, to the great benefit of the Congress, Mr. Yule came to see me at my house and told me that he entirely sympathised with the cause, and that if elected to be the President of the Congress of the year, he would be proud of the position and would do what he could for us. Those who had the good fortune to attend the Congress of 1888 know how manfully and how well he sustained the duties of his position; how he pointed out that the chief plank in the Congress platform—namely, the reform and re-constitution of the Legislative Councils of this country—was by no means an invention on the part of the Congress; that that point had received the attention and had been favourably considered and spoken of by that marvellous English statesman, Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield. He told us that we were treading on the footsteps of that great man, and

that if we perseveringly stuck to our colours, sometime or other we should get what we wanted. From that time to the day of his death Mr. Yule worked with us, gave us his valuable advice and helped us considerably as regards our working expenses. Pandit Ajudhianath, as you know, from the time he joined the Congress, worked early, worked late, worked with the old, worked with the young, never spared any personal sacrifices, so that he might do good to his country and to the Congress, and his lamented death came upon him when he was coming back from Nagpore after having worked there for the success of the Nagpore Congress of last year. Those who ever so slightly knew Pandit Ajudhianath and Mr. Yule will never be able to forget the great services which those gentlemen rendered to the Congress cause.

From Madras we have the sad news of the death of Salem Ramaswami Moodeliar. He was an earnest worker and did yeoman service to the cause of his country. In 1885, he was one of a band of three who were deputed to go to Great Britain during the then general elections: his colleagues being Mr. N. G. Chandavarkar of Bombay, and Mr. Manomohun Ghose of Calcutta, and these three devoted men vied with each other as to who could do the most work for the benefit of his country. Salem Ramaswami Moodeliar served on the Public Service Commission, and we all know the bitter disappointment he felt when the Secretary of State for India did not carry out what he had hoped he would, namely, accept the recommendations of the Public Service Commission as a whole. There were some recommendations of the Commission which Salem Ramaswami Moodeliar and those who worked with him did not approve; but in order that the recommendations of which they approved might be carried into effect, he and his colleagues gave in their adhesion to them, and all joined in signing the report. I remember that the report did not give any satisfaction to the country at large. We had discussions on the subject at the Congress of 1888, and some of us were very anxious that that report should be disavowed, and that we should by a resolution tell the

Government that the recommendations of the Commission did not come up to our expectations at all. Salem Ramaswami Moodeliar advised us not to agitate the matter then, but to wait until the Secretary of State's orders were out. If, he said, the Secretary of State accepted those recommendations, the matter might well be allowed to rest for some years to come; but if he did not do so then he, Ramaswami Moodeliar, would be the first to re-open the question and carry on the agitation to the end of his life, if necessary. He was a sagacious and courageous man and in him the Congress has lost a leader of eminence and earnestness. In Madras, we have also lost G. Mahadeva Chetty and Ramaswamy Naidu, both earnest Congress workers, and they will be missed by their Congress friends and acquaintances. In Bengal, we have had two heavy losses by the death of Prannath Pandit and Okhoy Coomar Dass. Prannath Pandit was the worthy son of a worthy father, the late Mr. Justice Sambhoonath Pandit—the first native gentleman who was appointed to the Bench of the High Court;—and though he died young, he was of great service to his country and to our cause, and had he been spared he would have done still greater services. Okhoy Coomar Dass was a younger man still, but his energy was great, and as a public man he outshone many of his contemporaries in Lower Bengal. It was due to him that many abuses in our Courts of Justice were exposed, and it was due to him that Howrah owes its standing Congress Committee. We grieve for all these spirits who have passed away from us, and I would beg leave, on behalf of this Congress, to express to their respective families our respective and reverential condolences in the great loss that has overtaken them. “Sorrow shared is sorrow soothed,” says the old adage, and if that be a fact, I have no doubt that our sympathy will go somewhat towards assuaging the grief of their families.

REFORM OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

Gentlemen, I must now proceed to call your attention to subjects more exciting, though with the exception of

a couple of them, I am not in a position to say, they are more cheering. The first piece of cheering news I have is that Lord Cross's India Councils Bill, after delays which seemed to many of us to be endless, has at last passed through the House of Parliament and received the Royal assent. From what we have been able to gather from the speeches delivered by the Viceroy during his tour in Madras, it would seem that the rules under which the Act is to be given effect to, are now under the consideration of the Government of India. We all know that the Act in terms does not profess to give us much, but it is capable, I believe, of infinite expansion under the rules that are to be framed. If those rules are framed in the spirit in which the present Prime Minister of England understood the Act was framed, and what he said was assented to by the then Under-Secretary of State for India, namely, that the people of India were to have real living representation in their Legislative Council—if those rules are framed in the spirit of true statesmanship such as one would have confidently expected from Sir Thomas Munro, Mountstuart Elphinstone, Lord William Bentinck, and a host of other distinguished Anglo-Indian statesmen who have made British India what she is—I have no doubt we shall all be glad to put away the first plank in our Congress platform, namely, the reform and reconstitution of the Legislative Councils. The spirits that seem to be abroad just now in this country, however, do not seem to me to give a very hopeful augury as to these rules. I am afraid that some of our rulers have been possessed with the idea that we have been progressing too fast. It is a great pity that this should be so. But if these rules do not come up to our expectations, Gentlemen, we must go on with our agitation and not stop until we get what we all think, and we all believe and, what is more, what our rulers themselves have taught us to believe, we have a right to get. (*Cheers.*)

DADABHAI NAOROJI'S RETURN TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Another cheering event to which I have to call attention is the return of our leader, our revered leader,

Dadabhai Naoroji (*three cheers*) to sit in the House of Commons as member for Central Finsbury. You all know it had been hoped that he would be able to come out from England to occupy the position I am now occupying. We all looked forward to his presence amongst us with hopefulness and trust and with great satisfaction, because, if he had been with us we could have shown to him, face to face, that our confidence in him is just as high as it ever was. We could have told him, by word of mouth, of the great joy which spread throughout the length and breadth of India when the news of his return to the House of Commons was received, of the anxiety with which we watched the fate of the election petition which was presented against his return, and how glad we were that it was at last withdrawn. And he could have carried back with him to England our message of gratitude to the electors of Central Finsbury (*cheers*), and have shown them that in electing him as their representative they had also elected a representative for the people of India in the House of Commons. (*Cheers*.) Unfortunately his opponent, Captain Penton, had presented that hateful petition and just at the moment that Mr. Naoroji was to have made his preparations to come out to India, it was fixed to be heard. Mr. Naoroji had to stay. There was a hand to hand struggle, and it was at last found that the number of votes for the two candidates was on a level. Captain Penton must have felt that if he went on any further his number might come down, and then Mr. Naoroji would retain his seat and Captain Penton would have to pay all the costs. He thought discretion the better part of valour, and prudently withdrew his petition, each party paying his own costs, and the seat of Mr. Naoroji is now perfectly safe. And as long as this present Parliament lasts, he will remain our member (*cheers*), and we shall get all the help it is possible for him to give us in the cause of Indian reforms. But we must not expect too much from him. He is but one in a House of 670 members, and though he will do for us all that prudence, good sense, vast knowledge and great eloquence can do, yet he is single-handed. To be strong.

he must receive all the support he can from this country, and backed by that support he may be able to put our case convincingly before the House. But what we really want is not that our countrymen generally should sit in the House of Commons, Englishmen themselves find it extremely hard to find seats there, how much more must we who are "black men". What we want and have a right to get is that our countrymen should have the opportunity of really representing to the Government the views of the people of this country in this country. What we want is that there should be responsible Government of India. I have always felt that the one great evil of the Indian administration is that our rulers are responsible to no one outside of their own consciences. That they conscientiously endeavour to do what they can for the good government of our country, may be accepted as an undeniable fact and accepted with gratitude. But it is not enough that our rulers should only be responsible to their own consciences. After all they are human beings, with human frailties, and human imperfections. It is necessary that they should be responsible to those over whom they have been placed by Providence to rule. (*Cheers.*) In making these observations I have not lost sight of the fact that the Government of India in India is responsible to the Government of India in Westminster, and that the Government of India in Westminster is responsible to the Cabinet of the day, of which he is invariably one of the members.

BRITISH CABINET AND HOUSE OF COMMONS

Nor have I forgotten that the Cabinet of the day is responsible to the House of Commons. But when you come to consider what this responsibility really is, I think you will all agree with me that I have not overstated the case in the slightest degree. Unless the Secretary of State for India happen to be a personage of exceptional force of character and of great determination, such as the late Prime Minister proved to be when he was in charge of the India Office, he generally, to use Burke's language, says "ditto" to the Government of India in India. The

Cabinet is so troubled with the affairs of the vast British Empire that the members really have no time to devote to India as a body, and leave her to their colleague the Secretary of State for India. When any Indian question comes before the House of Commons, what do we see? The Cabinet of the day has always a majority in the House, and it always finds supporters among its own party, whether they are would-be-placemen or whether they are country gentlemen who go to the House of Commons as the best club in England. (*Cheers.*) And in non-party matters—and they make it a pretence in the House of Commons to regard Indian affairs as matters non-party—in all non-party matters, the Government of the day can always rely upon a large amount of support from the Opposition. (*Hear, hear*) There are a few members of the House of Commons who make it a point to devote a portion of their time and energies to the consideration of Indian questions. But they are only a few; they have hardly any following; and if they press any matters on the attention of the House with any degree of zeal, they are voted down as bores by the rest of the House of Commons. (*Hear, hear.*) Of course the case of Mr. Bradlaugh (*cheers*) was entirely different. He was a most masterful man, and by his mastery over his fellow-men, he attained the position for himself which he occupied in the House of Commons at the time of his death. There are but few in England like Mr. Bradlaugh. I am sorry to say that since the death of that great man we have not been able to find one who possesses his capacity, possesses his knowledge, or possesses the influence which he exercised over the House of Commons. Therefore, when you consider what the responsibility of the Government of India is to the Government of England and the House of Commons, you will not, I think, be able to come to any other conclusion than that it is *nil*. (*Hear, hear.*)

RECONSTITUTION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

By the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils on lines that would allow representatives of the people to be elected to these Councils, the Government would be face

to face with them. They would know, at first hand, what the real feelings and the real grievances of the people are. (*Hear, hear.*) They would then be able to devise measures which would be in consonance with the feelings of the people and which would get rid of their grievances. At present *modus operandi* is this: A Secretary thinks that a particular measure ought to be passed, and it may be taken that he honestly believes that the measure would be for the benefit of the country. He invites two or three Indian gentlemen of eminence with whom he is acquainted to see him. He speaks to them in private and gets their views, which unfortunately, in the case of these Indian gentlemen, generally coincide with the views he himself holds. (*Laughter.*) The measure is passed. There is a great cry of indignation in the country. The answer of the Government is—"Oh, but we consulted the leaders of your society, and it is with their help this measure has been passed." I hold that the time has passed for this sort of statesmanship. If the Government make a real effort to arrive at what the views of the country and people generally are, I have no doubt that they will be able so to shape their policy as to give satisfaction to all concerned. This to my mind is the chief thing that we need. (*Hear, hear.*) In the Council, our representatives will be able to interpellate the Government with regard to their policy and the mode in which that policy is being given effect to. My conviction is that the weal and woe of our country is not so much dependent upon the Viceroy or the Local Governor, however sympathetic and kind, but upon the officials who have to administer the law and come in contact with the people. Until there is the right of interpellation granted to us in our own Councils, there will be no true responsibility on the part of our Government. I repeat that those who are placed over us, our Viceroys, Governors, Lieutenant-Governors and others of lesser degree, are more or less actuated by the desire to do us good, both for their own case as well as for the sake of the people of the country; but the system under which they work is a vicious one, and the result is, no good is really done. (*Cheers.*)

104823

MORE REVENUE OUGHT TO BE SPENT ON EDUCATION

Now, Gentlemen, while a Conservative Government has given us this India Councils Bill, and a Radical Constituency has sent one of our countrymen to the House of Commons, showing in the first instance some and, in the second, a great amount of liberality here in this country, we have had in a neighbouring province a policy adopted which has made a painfully profound sensation over the whole of this vast empire—a sensation which it will take a very long time to allay. In the first place, though we, in this Congress, and the country generally, have been pressing and pressing and pressing the Government not to take away the grants for education but to increase those grants, so far as the provinces of Bengal and Bombay are concerned, grants in aid of high education have been doomed. Government require, they say, money for primary education; they do not wish to spend money upon high education. I am not one of those who believe that primary education is not required. I think, it is as much required as high education. But I confess, I do not understand for a moment why it is necessary to starve high education in order that primary education may be provided for and protected. (*Cheers.*) Government ought to foster education of all kinds alike; it ought to spend its resources upon every kind of education (*renewed cheers*) for the people; not only primary education but technical education of all kinds, and also high education. It is said—"You who have had and who appreciate high education ought to maintain it yourselves." I know of no other country in which such a thing as this has been said by the Government to the people they rule over. It is one of the first duties of the Government to educate the people just as it is their duty to protect them from thieves and robbers. (*Cheers.*) If they tell the people to-day: "Go and educate yourselves," why should they not tell them to-morrow: "You are rich and can afford to keep darvans. Go and protect yourselves against thieves and robbers; we will not do so." (*Cheers.*)

WITHDRAWAL OF TRIAL BY JURY IN BENGAL

But the sensation to which I have referred, is one not so much due to the doings of our Bengal and Bombay Governments as regards high education, as to the notification which the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal has lately issued, withdrawing Trial by Jury in serious cases from the seven Districts in Bengal, where the system of Trial by Jury has been in existence for some years. (*Cries of "Shame."*) The plea upon which this notification has been based, is that Trial by Jury has been a failure as a means for the repression of crime. (*Cries of "Shame", and "No, no."*) Can it be said that if a Sessions Judge trying a case with the assistance of Assessors and without the assistance of a Jury acquit a prisoner, that he is a failure as a means for the repression of crime? If that cannot be said with regard to Sessions Judges, with what justice can it be said in regard to Juries? (*Cheers.*) Those of us who have had any acquaintance with the subject have long left that the administration of Criminal Justice in this country has been extremely unsatisfactory. There has not been much said about it, because it affects people, the majority of whom are poor men—men who cannot make much noise. They submit to what takes place, grumble among their fellows and cry *kismut*. Now let us see how the matter stands. While in Civil Cases the evidence is taken down in the language in which the witness gives it by an officer specially appointed for the purpose, and in Appeals the evidence thus taken down is made the basis of the judgment of the Appellate Court, where it differs from the notes of the Judge, in Criminal Cases the evidence is, as a rule, taken down by the presiding officer in English. Most of these presiding officers are gentlemen who come to us here from Great Britain. They, no doubt, try and learn the languages of the people they are sent out to govern, but the circumstances in which they are placed and the circumstances in which the people of this country are placed, are such that they are compelled to live in utter isolation from one another. You may read the books of a country, you may

know its literature well, but unless you have a familiar acquaintance with the people of the country, unless you have mixed familiarly with them, it is impossible for you to understand the language these people speak.

“BABU ENGLISH”

Why is there so much outcry about what is called “Babu English”? Many Babus, and in this designation I include my countrymen from all parts of India, know English literature better, I make bold to say, than many educated men in England. (*Cheers.*) They know English better, and English literature better than many continental English scholars. They know English History, as well, if not better, than Englishmen themselves. Why is it then that when they write English, when they speak English, they sometimes make grievous blunders? Why is it then that their composition is called stilted? Because their knowledge is derived from books only and not from contact with the people of England. If an English gentleman were to write a book or write a letter in the vernacular with which he is supposed to be most familiar, I am afraid his composition would bear a great family likeness to “Babu English”. It would be “English Vernacular”. It would contain grammatical mistakes which would even shame our average schoolboy. Let an English gentleman, thoroughly acquainted with the vernacular of a district, speak to a native of that district. His pronunciation would be such that the native, even if educated, would find it difficult to understand him. It is gentlemen of this description who hear country-people, called as witnesses before them, give their evidence in the vernacular. How is it possible for them to understand them correctly? How much do you think of what these witnesses say to the Judge is taken down correctly and finds a place in the Judge’s notes? (*Little or nothing.*)

MANNER OF APPEALS TO THE APPELLATE COURT

And when an appeal is preferred to the Appellate Court, it is this evidence and this evidence alone, upon which the Judges of that Court have to act. When the District Judge tries a Civil Case, he has the plaint and

written statement translated for him into English by his clerk. The evidence given before him is, as a rule, interpreted to him by the pleaders on either side. But when the same District Judge acts in his capacity as Sessions Judge and presides over Criminal Trials, he, as a rule, takes down the evidence without the aid of interpreters in English, and he charges the Jury, in Jury Cases, in the vernacular of the country. (*Laughter.*) The Indian Penal Code has been translated into all the vernaculars of the country, and those who know these languages and who know English, I think, are agreed that it is extremely difficult to make out what the vernacular Penal Code means; and charging the Jury in the vernacular means, that the Judges have to explain the Penal Code to them in the vernacular—a superhuman task almost! Again when in Civil Cases, pleaders and, particularly, pleaders of position are allowed a free hand as regards cross-examination in Criminal cases, particularly in cases where the accused is unable to employ pleaders of eminence, but is compelled to have either junior pleaders or *mukhters*, the cross-examination of the witnesses may be said almost to be a farce. The presiding officer gets impatient in a very short time, cuts short the cross-examination at his own sweet will and pleasure, and in many cases most important facts are not elicited in consequence. (*Hear, hear.*) While in Civil Appeals you, as a rule, get a patient hearing, the argument sometimes lasting for days; just think those of you who have any experience of these Courts, what takes place when Criminal Appeals are heard by Sessions Judges in the moffussil! They are often taken up at the fag end of the day and listened to with impatience, and then is asked the almost invariable question, as the Judge, after hearing the appeal for a few minutes, is about to rise for the day: "Have you any thing more to say; I will read the papers for myself and give the decision to-morrow." The Judge rises, and the poor man's appeal is over. Some appeals are dismissed and some, though this is more rare, are allowed. Again, while in civil cases there is hardly any fear of their being decided on facts outside the record, in criminal

cases there is the greatest fear that outside influence is brought to bear upon the presiding officer. The thing is inevitable when you consider that the District Magistrate is the real head of the Police of the district and that all officers trying criminal cases, except the Sessions Judge, are subordinate to him and depend on him for promotion; and as regards the Sessions Judges themselves, they may, by the system which has now been introduced of dividing the Civil Service into two branches, find themselves independent of the District Magistrate one day and his subordinate the next during the time he oscillates as acting Sessions Judge and Joint Magistrate, as not unoften happens. Again, in civil cases we have the right of appeal as of course, and if they are of sufficient value of appealing to Her Majesty in Council; in criminal cases we have to apply for leave, to appeal and have our appeal only from the Sessions Judge to the High Court, and from the inferior judiciary to the Sessions Judge, and in some cases to the District Magistrate. There are many other points to which attention may be called, but I think I have said enough to convince those who are not familiar with the matter, that I was right when I said that the administration of Criminal Justice in this country was most unsatisfactory. (*Cheers.*) The only safeguard which accused persons have against this system in Sessions Cases is Trial by Jury. (*Hear, hear.*) And now the notification of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal withdraws this safeguard from the seven districts in Bengal where it existed, and the whole of India has been threatened with a like withdrawal. (*Cries of "Shame".*) The question is not a provincial but an imperial one, and of the highest importance. I, therefore, think it is our duty to take this question up, and help our Bengal brethren to the utmost extent of our power to get back what they have lost, and to see that other parts of the country are not overtaken by the same fate. (*Hear, hear.*)

ALLEGED FAILURE OF TRIAL BY JURY

Let us for the moment consider what is the meaning of "Trial by Jury having failed as a means for the repression

of crime". One of the learned Judges of the Calcutta High Court who was consulted upon this matter, I refer to Mr. Justice Beverly, said that he did not think that a person bent upon committing a crime would stop to think whether, if he was detected, he would be tried by a Judge with a Jury or tried by a Judge with the aid of Assessors. (*Loud Cheers.*) Judges and Juries do not sit to repress crime but to ascertain if crime has been committed, and if the Jury find that crime has been committed, the Judge punishes the offender. (*Cheers.*) It is the duty of the Police to see that crime is not committed, and when, in spite of their vigilance, crime is committed, to bring the offender to justice. In this country, where unfortunately the Police are not overscrupulous as to how they get up cases, Trial by Jury is the most essential safeguard against injustice. Jurymen being drawn from the people themselves are better able to understand the language in which witnesses give their evidence, better able to understand and appreciate the demeanour of witnesses—the twists and turns in their answers, the rolling of their eyes, the scratching of their heads, and various other contortions of their physiognomy, which witnesses go through to avoid giving straight answers to straight questions—than the Judge upon whom, unless he be an officer of exceptional and brilliant talents, they are lost. (*Hear, hear.*) A former Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, himself a Sessions Judge of large experience, and therefore able to speak with authority on the subject—I allude to the late Sir A. Rivers Thompson—said in regard to Jurymen, that they were more scrupulous in accepting Police evidence than the Judges were, and that it was quite right that it should be so. The Law allows Sessions Judges to make references to the High Court if they differ from the verdict of a Jury. These references come up before the High Court, and the learned Judges of that Court have before them only the evidence recorded in English by the Sessions Judge, the evidence recorded in the Court of the Committing Magistrate and the Judge's charge. Though they may be men of brilliant talents, men of great experience, men of great conscientiousness, I still venture to think that it is

impossible for them human beings as they are—reading merely the dry bones of the evidence placed before them upon paper, to come to a correct conclusion as to whether the Judge was right or the Jury were right. (*Cheers.*) If they heard the evidence given by the witnesses in their presence, their conclusion would no doubt be accepted as more satisfactory, and if they differed from the Jury, it might be that the Jury were wrong, but under the present system how can that be done? How can it be said that when they accept the opinion of the Sessions Judges, the Sessions Judges are right and the Jury wrong? And in many of these references, the High Courts have accepted the verdict of the Jury and differed from the recommendation of the Judge. (*Cheers.*) The only ground for saying that the system of Trial by Jury has failed is, as I understand, that the High Court has in some instances differed from them, and adopted the recommendation of the Sessions Judge. I have told you, it is impossible—regard being had to the limitation of human nature—to say with confidence, who was right and who was wrong; but assuming that the Jury were wrong in many instances, and that they had given improper verdicts, what is the consequence? A few more persons who would have been in jail are now free men. What then? Has there been any complaint on the part of the people of these seven districts that they went about in fear of their lives, because by the obstinacy and perversity of Jurymen, accused persons who ought to have been condemned to death had been set free? (*Hear, hear.*) Did any one say that he or she regarded the system with disfavour or dislike or fear? Had anyone suggested that the system should be abolished? I say emphatically, No! No complaint reached the Government from the people affected that the system had failed. It is the overflowing desire on the part of the Government to do good to us that has been the cause of the withdrawal of this system! Save us from our well-wishers, say I. (*Loud cheers.*) I could have understood the action of Government if there had been any hue and cry in the country on the subject. I could have understood it if any representation had come.

from those affected to the Government; but under the circumstances this bolt from the blue, I do not understand and cannot appreciate. (*Loud applause.*) It is said that Trial by Jury is foreign to this country. We who have cherished our Panchayat system for generations to be told that Trial by Jury is foreign to us, to be told so at the fag end of the nineteenth century, why it is strange indeed! No, no, Gentlemen—it was on our Panchayat system that Lord Cornwallis proceeded when in 1790 he ruled that we should have Trial by Jury. It was on that system that Sir Thomas Munro based his Regulation, which his successor promulgated in 1827. It was on that system that the Bombay Regulation on the subject was introduced, and when these Regulations were codified in 1861, it was on that system the law was based. We must have the system extended to the whole country and not withdrawn from any part of it, and we must therefore join together and agitate on the subject from one end of India to the other, and say that this notification, which has given rise to so much discontent, was not required, and that it should be withdrawn, and withdrawn as speedily as possible, and the policy of which it is the outcome, reversed. (*Loud applause.*)

EUROPEAN ALOOFNESS FROM THE CONGRESS MOVEMENT

I am afraid, Gentlemen, I have detained you longer than I should have done. (*Cries of "No, no and go on".*) I have but a few more words to say and these I shall say as briefly as I can. I said at the outset that the Congress movement has been a great success, but it behoved us all to make it even a greater success than it is. During the Jury agitation in Bengal I was greatly pained, more pained than I can describe, by one of the apologists of the Government saying openly in his paper that the agitation against the Jury Notification was of no account because it was only a "native" agitation and that no Europeans had joined it. As a matter of fact, I know from personal knowledge that a great many very respectable and independent gentlemen in Calcutta joined the movement and cordially sympathised with it. But supposing it had

been otherwise ? This same apologist has, day after day, pointed out that the withdrawal of Trial by Jury, in these seven Bengal districts, in serious cases does not in any way touch Europeans or European British subjects. If he is right in this, it is a matter of no surprise that Europeans have not joined the movement. But because Europeans have not joined the movement, is a movement of the people of this country to be despised ? Is our voice not to be listened to, because forsooth to that voice has not been added the voice of our European fellow-subjects ? (*Hear, hear, and cheers*) We would welcome, welcome with open arms, all the support which we can get from our European fellow-subjects. I believe that so far as the non-official Europeans are concerned, their interests and ours in this country are the same ; we all desire that there should be a development of the resources of the country and that there should be enough for all who are here, whether for a time or in perpetuity. (*Hear, hear.*) But apart from that, why is our voice to be despised ? It is we who feel the pinch ; it is we who have to suffer, and when we cry out, it is said to us : "O ! we cannot listen to you ; yours is a contemptible and useless and a vile agitation, and we will not listen to you." Time was when we natives of the country agitated about any matter, with the help of non-official Europeans, the apologists of the Government used to say triumphantly : "This agitation is not the agitation of the natives of the country, but has been got up by a few discontented Europeans ; don't listen to them, it is not their true voice ; it is the voice of these Europeans." But now we are told : "Don't listen to them, it is their own voice and not the voice of the Europeans." (*Shame.*) It is said that such reflections should be published by responsible journalists pretending to be in the confidence of our rulers. I hope and confidently trust that these are not the sentiments by which any administration in India is actuated.

I hope and trust that when we make respectful representations to the Government, they will be considered on their own merits, whether we are joined in our

agitation by our European fellow-subjects, or whether we stand by ourselves ; and in order that these representations of ours, not only on the Jury question, but on other questions which touch us, may succeed, it is necessary that we in our Congress should work and work with a will. It is not enough that you should come from long distances and be present at the annual sittings of the Congress. It is necessary, when you go back to your respective provinces and districts, that you should display the same zeal and interest there. It has been the habit to leave the whole of the Congress work to the Secretary. We go back to our districts and sleep over it, and leave the Secretary to do all he can for the business, in the shape of getting money, and then when it is time for the Sessions to be held, we put on our best clothes, pack up our trunks and go. But that is not work. Let us all on our parts act zealously and make sacrifices ; without money it is impossible to be successful in anything. Let each of us go back and help our respective Secretaries ; let us try and get as much money as we can for the success of the cause. (*Hear, hear.*)

You all know that our cause has the support of some distinguished men in England, who form what is called the Congress Committee in England. They are willing to give us their services unstintingly, ungrudgingly, but you cannot expect them to give their services to us at their own expense. You cannot expect that the necessary expenses required for the hiring of rooms, for the printing of papers, for the despatch of telegrams, and all other things necessary for carrying on the great cause, shall be paid out of their own pockets. We must do our best to support them ; we must do our best to support the cause ; and if we are true to ourselves, if we are true to our principles, if we are true to our country, be assured that in the fulness of time all that you require from the benign Government of the British nation, all that you seek from them to make you true citizens, will be given to you by that nation.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI, M.P.

DADABHAI'S INTEREST IN THE PUNJAB

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—I need not say how deeply I feel the honour you have done me by electing me a second time to preside over your deliberations. I thank you sincerely for this honour. In the performance of the onerous duties of this high position I shall need your great indulgence and support, and I have no doubt that I shall receive them. (*Applause.*)

I am much pleased that I have the privilege of presiding at the very first Congress held in Punjab, as I had at Calcutta in 1886. I have taken, as you may be aware, some interest in the material condition of Punjab. In my first letter to the Secretary of State for India, in 1880, on the material condition of India, I took Punjab for my illustration, and worked out in detail its total annual income and the absolute wants of its common labourer. As to the loyalty of the Punjabis—Hindus, Sikhs, or Muhammadans—it has proved true through the most fiery ordeal on a most trying and critical occasion. (*Applause.*)

The occasion of this Session of the Congress in Punjab has been a most happy coincidence. On Punjab rests a double responsibility, one external and one internal. If ever that hated threatened invasion of the Russians comes on, Punjab will have to bear the first brunt of the battle, and contented under British rule, as I hope India will be, Punjab will fight to her last man in loyalty and patriotism—loyalty to the British Power, and patriotism to protect the hearths and homes of her beloved country of India. (*Loud applause.*)

PUNJAB'S RESPONSIBILITY IN SAFEGUARDING THE EMPIRE

The internal responsibility which at present rests upon the Punjabis and other warrior races of India is this. I have always understood and believed that manliness was associated with love of justice, generosity and intellect. So our British tutors have always taught us and have always claimed for themselves such character. And I cannot understand how any one could or should deny to you and other manly races of India the same characteristics of human nature. But yet we are gravely told that on the contrary the manliness of these races of India is associated with meanness, unpatriotic selfishness, and inferiority of intellect, and that therefore like the dog in the manger, you and the other warrior races will be mean enough to oppose the resolution about Simultaneous Examinations, and unpatriotic and selfish enough to prevent the general progress of all India. (*Shame.*)

Can offence and insult to a people, and that people admitted to be a manly people, go any further? Look at the numbers of Punjabis studying in England. Note this happy coincidence of this meeting in Punjab: you, considering every son of India as an Indian and a compatriot, have invited me—not a Punjabi, not a Muhammadan, nor a Sikh—from a distance of thousands of miles to enjoy the honour of presiding over this Congress, and with this gathering from all parts of India as the guests of the Punjabis, you conclusively once for all and for ever set the matter at rest that the Punjabis with all other Indians do earnestly desire the Simultaneous Examinations as the only method in which justice can be done to all the people of India, as this Congress has repeatedly resolved. And, moreover, Punjab has the credit of holding the very first public meeting in favour of the Resolution passed by the House of Commons for Simultaneous Examinations. (*Cheers.*)

When I use the words English or British, I mean all the peoples of the United Kingdom.

DEATH OF JUSTICE TELANG

It is our melancholy duty to record the loss of one of our greatest patriots, Justice Kasinath Trimbak Telang. It is a heavy loss to India; you all know what a high place he held in our estimation for his great ability, learning, eloquence, sound judgment, wise counsel and leadership. I have known him and worked with him for many years, and I have not known any one more earnest and devoted to the cause of our country's welfare. He was one of the most active founders of this Congress, and was its first hard-working Secretary in Bombay. From the very first he had taken a warm interest and active part in our work, and even after he became a Judge, his sound advice was always at our disposal.

RECENT HIGHER APPOINTMENTS TO INDIANS

I am glad Mr. Mahadhev Govind Ranade is appointed in his place. (*Cheers.*) It does much credit indeed to Lord Harris for the selection, and I am sure Mr. Ranade will prove himself worthy of the post. I have known him long, and his ability and learning are well known. (*Applause.*) His sound judgment and earnest work in various ways have done valuable services to the cause of India. (*Applause.*)

I am also much pleased that an Indian, Mr. Pramada Charan Bannerji, succeeds Mr. Justice Mahmud at Allahabad. (*Cheers.*)

I feel thankful to the Local Government and the Indian Government for such appointments, and to Lord Kimberley for his sanction of them among which I may include also the decision about the Sanskrit Chair at Madras. (*Applause.*) I feel the more thankful to Lord Kimberley, for I am afraid, and I hope I may be wrong that there has been a tendency of not only not loyally carrying out the rule about situations of Rs. 200 and upwards to be given to Indians, but that even such posts as have been already given to them are being snatched away.

from their hands. Lord Kimberley's firmness in not allowing this is therefore so much the more worthy of praise and our thankfulness.

Lord Kimberley also took prompt action to prevent the retrograde step in connection with the Jury system in Bengal for which Mr. Paul and other friends interested themselves in Parliament; and also to prevent the retrograde interference with the Chairmanship of Municipalities at the instance of our British Committee in London. I do hope that in the same spirit Lord Kimberley will consider our representations about the extension of the Jury system.

A MESSAGE FROM CENTRAL FINSBURY

Before proceeding further, let me perform the gratifying task of communicating to you a message of sympathy and good-will which I have brought for you from Central Finsbury. (*Loud applause and three cheers for the electors of Central Finsbury.*) On learning that I had accepted your invitation to preside, the Council of the Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association passed a Resolution, which I have now the pleasure of placing before you, signed by Mr. Joseph Walton, the Chairman, and forwarded to me by the Honorary Secretary, Mr. R. M. H. Griffith, one of my best friends and supporters.

The Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association, in view of Mr. Naoroji's visit to India at the end of November next, have passed the following Resolution :

" 1. That the General Council of the Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association desire to record their high appreciation of the admirable and most exemplary manner in which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has performed his duties as representative of this constituency in the House of Commons and learning that he is, in the course of a few months, to visit India to preside over the Ninth Session of the Indian National Congress, request him to communicate to that body an expression of their full sympathy alike with all the efforts of that Congress for the welfare of India, and with the Resolution which has been recently passed by the House of Commons (in the adoption of which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has been so largely instrumental) in favour of holding Simultaneous Examinations in India and in Britain of candidates for all the Indian Civil Services, and further express the earnest

hope that full effect will, as speedily as possible, be given by the Government to this measure of justice which has been already too long delayed. (*Applause.*)

"2. That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

"(Signed) JOSEPH WALTON,

Chairman of Meeting."

The Resolution has been sent to Mr. Naoroji with an accompanying letter, which says:

"Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association,
20, St. John Street Road, Clerkenwell,
London, E.C.

"DEAR SIR,—I have been directed to forward to you the enclosed copy of Resolution passed at the last meeting of the Council of this Association.

"Joining in the hope of my colleagues that the result of our efforts may be of material and lasting good and wishing you a fruitful journey, with a speedy return to us, the constituents you so worthily represent in Parliament.

"I am, yours faithfully,

"R. M. H. GRIFFITHS,
Honorary Secretary.

"The Honourable DADABHAI NAOROJI, M.P.,
House of Commons, Westminster,
August 1893."

ANGLO-INDIAN VIEWS ON THE EDUCATED NATIVES

The fact is, and it stands to reason, that the thinking portion and the educated, whether in English or in their own learning, of all classes and creeds, in their common nationality as Indians, are naturally becoming the leaders of the people. Those Indians, specially, who have received a good English education, have the double advantage of knowing their own countrymen as well as understanding and appreciating the merits of British men and British rule, with the result, as Sir Bartle Frere has well put it:

And now wherever I go I find the best exponents of the policy of the English Government, and the most able co-adjutors in adjusting that policy to the peculiarities of the natives of India, among the ranks of the educated natives. (*Applause.*)

Or, as the Government of India has said :

To the minds of at least the educated among the people of India—and the number is rapidly increasing—any idea of the subversion of the British power is abhorrent. (*Hear, hear.*)—Government of India's Despatch, dated 8th June 1880, to Secretary of State for India.

And as Lord Dufferin, as Viceroy of India, has said. in his Jubilee Speech :

We are surrounded on all sides by native gentlemen of great attainments and intelligence, from whose hearty, loyal and honest co-operation we may hope to derive the greatest benefit. (*Applause.*)

It would be the height of unwisdom, after themselves creating this great new force, "which is rapidly increasing" as "the best exponents and co-adjutors," as "abhorring the subversion of the British power," and from whose "hearty, loyal and honest co-operation the greatest benefit can arise," that the ruling authorities should drive this force into opposition instead of drawing it to their own side by taking it into confidence and thereby strengthening their own foundation. This Congress represents the Aristocracy of intellect and the New Political Life, created by themselves, which is at present deeply grateful to its Creator. Common sense tells you—have it with you, instead of against you.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS IN ENGLAND AND INDIA

With regard to your other most important Resolution, to hold examinations simultaneously both in India and England for all the Civil Services, it would not have become a practical fact by the Resolution of the House of Commons of 2nd June last, had it not been to a large extent for your persevering but constitutional demand for it made with moderation during all the years of your existence. (*Applause.*) I am glad that in the last Budget Debate the Under-Secretary of State for India has given us this assurance :

It may be in the recollection of the House that, in my official capacity, it was my duty earlier in the Session to oppose a Resolution in favour of Simultaneous Examinations, but the House

of Commons thought differently from the Government. That once done, I need hardly say that there is no disposition on the part of the Secretary of State for India or myself to attempt to thwart or defeat the effect of the vote of the House of Commons, on that Resolution. (*Hear, hear, and applause.*)—*Debates Vol. XVII, 1833, p. 1835.*

We all cannot but feel thankful to the Secretary of State, Lord Kimberley and the Under-Secretary of State, Mr. George Russell, for this satisfactory assurance.

I may just remark here in passing that I am not able to understand why the higher Civil and Educational Medical Services are handed over to Military Medical Officers, instead of there being a separate Civil Medical Service, dealt with by Simultaneous Examinations in India and England, as we expect to have for the other Civil Services. I also may ask why some higher Civil Engineering posts are given to Military Engineers.

BRITISH INTEREST IN INDIAN AFFAIRS

One thing more I may say: Your efforts have succeeded not only in creating an interest in Indian affairs, but also a desire among the people of the United Kingdom to promote our true welfare. (*Hear, hear.*) Had you achieved in the course of the past eight years only this much and no more, you would have amply justified your existence. (*Cheers.*) You have proved two things—that you are moderate and reasonable in what you ask, and that the British people are willing to grant what is shown to be reasonable.

It is not necessary for me to enlarge upon the subject of your justification further than this, that all the Resolutions you have formulated have more or less advanced; that they are receiving attentive consideration is testified by the continuous discussions that have been going on in the Press and on the platform both here and in England. In England itself many a cause, great or small, has to agitate long before making an impression. What struggles have there been in Parliament itself and out of Parliament for the Corn Laws, Slavery Laws, Factory

Laws, Parliamentary Reforms, and many others; in short, in every important Legislation? We must keep courage, persevere, and "never say die". (*Loud applause.*)

RECEPTION TO DADABHAI NAOROJI IN PARLIAMENT

One more result, though not the least, of your labours, I shall briefly touch upon. The effect which your labours produced on the minds of the people of the United Kingdom has helped largely an Indian to find his way into the Great Imperial Parliament, and in confirmation of this, I need not go further than remind you of the generous action of Central Finsbury and the words of the Resolution of the Council of its United Liberal and Radical Association which I have already placed before you. (*Applause.*)

As you are all aware, though it was long my wish my friend the Hon. Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose made the first attempt, and twice contested Deptford, with no little chances of success, but adverse circumstances proved too strong for him. We owe a debt of gratitude to Deptford, and also to Holborn, which gave me the first lift, and in my contest there, though a forlorn hope, the Liberal electors exerted their utmost, and gave me a very satisfactory poll. (*Cheers.*)

My mind also turns to those good friends of India—Bright, Fawcett, Bradlaugh and others (*applause*)—who pioneered for us, prepared for the coming of this result, and helped us when we were helpless.

This naturally would make you desire and lead me to say a few words about the character of the reception given to the Indian Member in the House of Commons. It was everything that could be desired. (*Cheers.*) The welcome was general from all sides, as the interest in Indian affairs has been much increasing, and there is a desire to do justice to India. (*Renewed cheering.*) Mr. Gladstone on two occasions not only expressed his satisfaction to me at finding an Indian in the House, but expressed also a strong wish to see several more.

The attendance on Indian questions has been good, and what is still better, the interest in the Indian debates has been earnest, and with a desire to understand and judge rightly. India has indeed fared well this Session, notwithstanding its other unprecedentedly heavy work.

PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST IN INDIAN QUESTIONS

Thankful as we are to many Members of all sides, I am bound to express our special thanks to the Irish Labour and Radical Members. (*Loud cheers.*) I heard from Mr. Davitt, two days before my departure: "Don't forget to tell your colleagues at the Congress that every one of Ireland's Home Rule Members in Parliament is at your back in the cause of the Indian People." (*Prolonged cheering.*) All our friends who had been working for us before are not only as zealous and staunch as ever, but more active and earnest. I cannot do better than to record in this place with thankfulness the names of all those Members from all parties who voted for the Resolution of 2nd June last in favour of Simultaneous Examinations in England and India for all the Indian Civil Services.*

As the ballot fell to Mr. Herbert Paul (*three cheers for Mr. Paul*) he, as you are aware, moved the Resolution, and you know also how well and ably he advocated the cause, and has ever since kept up a watchful interest in and eye on it. I may mention here that I had sent a whip or notice to every Member of the House of Commons for this debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed: "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "all open Competitive Examinations heretofore held in England alone for appointments to the Civil Services of India shall henceforth be held simultaneously both in India and England, such Examinations in both

* The names are omitted.

countries being identical in their nature, and all who compete being finally classified in one list according to merit".—*Mr. Paul.*

Question put: "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided; Ayes 76, Noes 84.

I may say here a few words about the progress we are making in our Parliamentary position. By the exertions of Sir William Wedderburn (*applause*), Mr. Caine (*applause*) and other friends, an Indian Parliamentary Committee has been formed, of which Sir William Wedderburn is the Chairman, and Mr. Herbert Roberts is the Secretary. (*Applause.*) The Committee is not yet fully formed. It will, we hope, be a larger General Committee of our supporters with a small Executive Committee, like other similar Committees that exist in the House for other causes. I give the names of the Members now fully enrolled in this Committee:

Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Caine, Mr. John E. Ellis, Dr. W. A. Hunter, Mr. Illingworth, Sir Wilfred Lawson, Mr. Walter B. McLaren, Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. H. Paul, Sir Joseph Pease, Mr. T. H. Roberts, Mr. R. T. Reid, Mr. Samuel Smith, Mr. C. E. Schwann, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Webb, Sir W. Wedderburn.

Besides these, there are a large number of Members (exclusive of the 70 or 80 Irish Members already referred to) whom we count as supporters, and hope to see fully enrolled Members on our Indian Parliamentary Committee before long.

On the eve of my departure, the Committee invited me to a private dinner at the House, and gave me a hearty God-speed and wishes of success, with an expression of their earnest desire to see justice done to India. (*Applause.*)

Before leaving this subject of Parliament, let me offer to Mr. George Russell, the Under-Secretary of State for India, my sincere thanks for his sympathetic and cordial

treatment of me in all I had to do with him, and for his personal good feeling and kindness towards me. (*Applause.*)

FUTURE OF THE CONGRESS

With all that has been done by the Congress, we have only begun our work. We have yet much and very much more work to do till that political, moral and material condition is attained by us which will raise us really to the level of our British fellow-citizens in prosperity and political elevation, and thereby consolidate the British power on the imperishable foundation of justice, mutual benefit and the contentment and loyalty of the people.

The reason why I have dwelt upon our past life is that it shows that our future is promising and hopeful, that our faith in the instinctive love of justice and fair play of the people of the United Kingdom is not misplaced, and that if we are true to ourselves and learn from the British character the self-sacrifice and perseverance which the British so largely possess, we need never despair of obtaining every justice and reform which we may reasonably claim as our birthright as British citizens. (*Cheers.*)

What then is to be our future work? We have yet to surmount much prejudice, prepossessions, and misapprehension of our true, material and political condition. But our course is clear and straight before us. On the one hand we need not despair or quarrel with those who are against us; we should on the other hand go on steadily, perseveringly and moderately with the representation of our grievances and just rights.

REFORM OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

In connection with the question of our Legislative Councils we have yet very much work before us. Not only are the present rules unsatisfactory even for the fulfilment of the present Act itself as interpreted in the House by Mr. Gladstone, not only have we yet to obtain the full "living representation" of the people of India in these Councils, but also much further extension of

their present extremely restricted powers which render the Councils almost a mere name. By the Act of 1861 (19), without the permission of the Governor-General no member can introduce any measure (which virtually amounts to exclusion) about matters affecting the public debt or public revenues or for imposing any charge on such revenue, or the discipline and maintenance of any part of Her Majesty's Military or Naval Forces. This means that, as far as the spending of our money is concerned, the Legislative Council is simply as if it did not exist at all. (*Cries of "Shame, shame".*) No motion can be made by any member unless such motion be for leave to introduce some measure or have reference to some measure actually introduced thereunto. Thus there is no opportunity of calling any Department or Government to account for their acts. (Sec. 52.) All things which shall be done by the Secretary of State shall have the same force and validity as if this Act (1861) had not been passed. Here is full arbitrary power. By the Act (1892 Sec. 52), no member shall have power to submit or propose any resolution or to divide the Council in respect of any such financial discussion, or the answer to any question asked under the authority of this Act or the rules made under this Act. Such is the poor character of the extent of concession made to discuss finances or to put questions. Rules made under this Act (1892) shall not be subject to alteration or amendment at meetings for the purpose of making Laws and Regulations. Also (Act 1861, Sec. 22) the Secretary of State for India can by an Act of Parliament raise any money in the United Kingdom for the Government of India, and thus pile up any amount of burden on the Indian taxpayer, without his having a word to say upon it. We are to all intents and purposes under an arbitrary rule, and are just only about at the threshold of a true Legislative Council.

INDIAN BUDGET DEBATE

Amongst the most important work of the Councils is the Budget. What is the condition of the Budget debate both here and in England? The House of Commons

devotes week after week for supply of the English Budget, when every item of expenditure is discussed or may be altered; and not only that, but the conduct of the department during the year is brought under review, which becomes an important check to any arbitrary, unjust or illegal action. But what is the Indian Budget debate or procedure? Here the financial Statement is made by the Finance Minister. Then a week or so after, a few speeches are made to no practical effect, no practical motion or resolution, and the whole thing is over. (*Shame.*) Somewhat similar is the fate of the Indian Budget in the House of Commons, with the advantage of proposing any amendments and, at least, of having one amendment with practical effect of a division, or vote. But there is also the important advantage of bringing in any Indian measure or motion in the course of the Session in accordance with the rules and orders of the House like any other measure or motion. I felt thankful that at the last Budget debate, though there was the usual additional agony of the last day of the Session, yet there was not also the agony of scanty attendance, thanks to the increasing interest in the House in Indian matters and to the friends of India. (*Applause.*) In both places no practical check on any waste, extravagant or unnecessary expenditure. I am not at present discussing the merits of such Councils and restriction of powers, but that such matters will require your attention and consideration, that even in this one matter of Legislative Councils you have yet to secure Mr. Gladstone's "real living, representative voice of the people" being heard upon every detail of the Government of British India. (*Hear, hear.*)

INDIAN REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT

There is, however, another important matter—I mean the direct representation from India in the Imperial Parliament. (*Applause.*) As all our Imperial questions and relations between India and the United Kingdom, all amendments of Parliamentary Acts already passed and existing, or all important Acts that may be and can be only passed hereafter in Parliament, and all our ultimate appeals

can be settled in Parliament alone, it is of extreme importance that there should be some reasonable direct representation from India in the House of Commons and the representatives may be Indians or Europeans as long as they are the choice directly of Indian Constituencies, just as you have delegates to this Congress of Indians or Europeans.

Central Finsbury has been generous to us; other constituencies may also extend to us such generous consideration and help, but it is not fair that we should be left to depend upon the generosity of English Constituencies. (*Hear, hear.*) Under present circumstances we have a right to have direct representation. I hope the time is not very distant when we may successfully appeal to Parliament to grant us the true status of British political citizenship. (*Cheers.*) I do not overlook that several matters will have to be considered, and I am not at present placing before you a cut-and-dry scheme. My only object is to draw your attention to this vital subject.

POVERTY OF INDIA

But the greatest question before you, the question of all questions, is the Poverty of India. (*Hear, hear.*) This will be, I am much afraid, the great future trouble both of the Indian people and of the British Rulers. It is the rock ahead. In this matter we are labouring under one great disadvantage. This poverty we attribute to the system, and not to the officials who administer that system. (*Hear, hear and applause.*) But unfortunately for us, for themselves and the British people, the officials (with clear-sighted exceptions of course) make the matter personal, and do not consider impartially and with calmness of judgment this all important subject. The present Duke of Devonshire has well put this state of the official mind, which is peculiarly applicable in connection with this subject. He said :

The Anglo-Indian, whatever may be his merits, and no doubt they are just, is not a person who is distinguished by an exceptionally calm judgment.—Speech, H. of C., 23 rd August, 1883.

Mr. Gladstone also lately, in the Opium debate, remarked :

That it was a sad thing to say, but unquestionably it happens not infrequently in human affairs, that those who from their situation ought to know the most and the best, yet from prejudice and prepossessions knew the least and the worst.

This has been our misfortune with officials. But there have been and are some thoughtful officials who know the truth, like Lord Lawrence and others in the past, and in the present times like the latest Finance Ministers: Lord Cromer, Sir Auckland Colvin, and Sir David Barbour, who have perceived and stated the terrible truth that British India is extremely poor. Among other officials several have testified to the sad fact in "Confidential Reports", which Government do not publish—and this after a hundred years of the work of these officials under the present unnatural system. The system being unnatural, were the officials the very angels themselves, or as many Gladstones, they cannot prevent the evils of the system and cannot do much good. When Mr. Bayley and I moved for a Royal Commission of Inquiry, it was said that I had not produced evidence of poverty, it was not so; but it is difficult to make those see who would not see. (*Laughter and applause.*) To every member of the House, I had previously sent my papers of all necessary evidence on the annual income and absolute wants of the people of India. I do not know whether any of those who opposed us had taken the trouble to read this, and it was unfair to expect that in making out a *prima facie* case for our motion, I should reiterate, with the unnecessary waste of some hours of the precious time of the House, all the evidence already in their hands.

POVERTY OF INDIA AND OFFICIAL STATISTICS

You remember my papers on the Poverty of India, and I have asked for Returns to bring up information to date, so that a fair comparison of the present with the past may enable the House to come to a correct judgment. I am sorry the Government of India refuses to make a return of a Note prepared so late as 1881 by Sir David

Barbour, upon which the then Finance Minister (Lord Cromer) based his statement in his speech in 1882 about the extreme poverty of the mass of the people. I do not see why the Government of India should refuse. The Note, I am told, is an important document. Government for its own sake should be ready to give it. In 1880, the present Duke of Devonshire, then Secretary of State for India, readily gave me some statistics and information prepared by Mr. F. Danvers, though I did not know of their existence. This enabled me to point out some errors and to explain some points which had been misunderstood. Such information is extremely necessary, not merely for the sake of the exceedingly poor masses of the people, but for the very stability of the British power itself.

The question of the Poverty of India should be fully raised, grappled with and settled. The Government ought to deal boldly and broadly with it. Let there be a return in detail, correctly calculated, made every year of the *total* annual income of *all* British India, per head of population, and of the requirements of a labourer to live in working health, and not as a starved beast of burden. Unless such complete and accurate information is given every year in detail, it is idle and useless to make mere unfounded assertions that India is prospering.

It must also be remembered that Lord Cromer's annual average of not more than Rs. 27 per head is for the whole population, including the rich and all classes, and not what the great mass of the population can or do actually get. Out of the total annual income of British India, all that portion must be deducted which belongs to European Planters, Manufacturers, and Mine owners, and not to the people of British India, excepting the poor wages they receive, to grudge to give away their own country's wealth, to the benefit of a foreign people. Another portion is enjoyed in and carried out from the country on a far larger share per head by many who are not the children of the soil—official and non-official. Then the upper and middle classes of the Indians themselves

receive much more than their average share. The great mass of the poor people therefore have a much lower average than even the wretched "not more than Rs. 27" per head.

You know that I had calculated the average of the income as being Rs. 20 per head per annum, and when Lord Cromer's statement of Rs. 27 appeared, I requested him to give me his calculations but he refused. However, Rs. 20 or "not more than Rs. 27"—how wretched is the condition of a country of such income, after a hundred years of the most costly administration, and can such a thing last? (*Cries of "No, no."*)

It is remarkable that there is no phase of the Indian problem which clear-headed and fair-minded Anglo-Indians have not already seen and indicated. More than a hundred years ago, in 1787, Sir John Shore wrote these remarkable, far-seeing, and prophetic words:

Whatever allowance we may make for the increased industry of the subjects of the State, owing to the enhanced demand for the produce of it (supposing the demand to be enhanced), there is reason to conclude that the benefits are more than counter-balanced by evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion.—*Parl. Ret.* 377 of 1812.

And these words of prophecy are true to the present day. I pass over what has been said by other European officials at different times during the hundred years. I come to 1886, and here is a curious and complete response after a hundred years by the Secretary of State for India. In a Despatch (26th January, 1886) to the Treasury, he makes a significant admission about the consequences of the character of the Government of the foreign rule of Britain. He says:

The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of the public revenues is very peculiar, not merely from the habits of the people and their strong aversion to change which is more specially exhibited to new forms of taxation, but likewise from the character of the Government, which is in the hands of foreigners, who hold all the principal administrative offices and form so large a part of the Army. The imposition of new taxation which would have to be borne wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country and virtually to meet additions to charges

arising outside of the country would constitute a political danger, the real magnitude of which, it is to be feared, is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge of or concern in the Government of India, but which those responsible for that Government have long regarded as of the most serious order.

What a strange confirmation, fulfilment and explanation of the very reason of the prophecy of a hundred years ago, and admission now that because the character of the present Government is such that "*it is in the hands of the foreigners who hold all the principal administrative offices and form so large a part of the Army*," the consequence of it is a "*political danger*", the real magnitude of which is "*of the most serious order*".

Need I, after this declaration even, despair that some of our Anglo-Indian friends would not take a lesson from the Secretary of State and understand the evil of the system under which India is suffering? Have I ever said anything clearer or stronger than this despatch has done? It gives my whole fear of the future perils to the people of India and political danger to the British power, in a nutshell. This shows that some of our Anglo-Indian authorities have not been, nor are so dull and blind as not to have seen before or see now the whole peril of the position, and the unnatural and suicidal system of administration.

Yes, figures are quoted by some of what they call "increase of trade", "balances of trade in favour of India", "increase of industry", "hoarding of treasure in British India", etc., etc.; but our misfortune is that these people, with bias and prejudices and prepossessions, and apparently having not very clear ideas of the principles, processes, and details of commercial and banking operations and transactions, and of the perturbations of what Sir John Shore called "the evils of a distant foreign dominion", are not able to understand and read aright these facts and figures of the commercial and economic conditions of British India. These people do not realise or seem to understand that what are called "the trade returns of British India" are misleading, and are not the trade returns of British India. A good portion of both the

imports and exports of both merchandise and treasure belong to the Native States and to countries beyond the borders and not to British India. A separate return must be made of the imports and exports of the non-British territories, so that a correct account of the true trade of British India may be given by itself—and then there should be some statement of the exports which are not trade exports at all, but only political and private European remittances; and then only will it be seen how wretched this British Indian true trade is, and how fallacious and misleading the present returns are. A return is made every year called "The Material and Moral Progress of India". But that part regarding "Material Progress", to which I am confining my observations, is very imperfect and misleading. As I have already said, nothing short of a return every year of the average annual income per head of population of British India, and of the absolute necessities of life for a healthy labourer, in detailed calculation can give any correct idea of the progress or otherwise of the material condition of the people of British India. I ask for "detailed calculation" in the returns, because some of the officials seem to have rather vague notions of the Arithmetic of Averages, and though the foundation figures may be correct, they bring out results far from truth. I have pointed out this with instances in my papers. I have communicated with the Secretary of State for India, and he has communicated with the Governments in India. But I do not know how far this correction has been attended to by those who calculate averages.

TRADE BETWEEN ENGLAND AND INDIA

What is grievous is that the present unnatural system, as predicted by Sir John Shore, is destructive to us, with a partial benefit to the United Kingdom with our curse upon it. But were a natural system to prevail, the commercial and industrial benefits aided by perfect free-trade that exists between India and the United Kingdom will be to both countries of an extent of which we can at present form no conception.

But here is an inexhaustible market of 221,000,000 of their own civilised fellow-citizens with some 66,000,000 more of the people of the Native States, and what a great trade would arise with such an enormous market, and the United Kingdom would not for a long time hear anything about her "unemployed". It is only some people of the United Kingdom of the higher classes that at present draw all the benefit from India. The great mass of the people do not derive that benefit from the connection with India which they ought to get with benefit to both countries. On the other hand, it is with the Native States that there is some comparatively decent trade. With British India, as compared with its population, the trade of the United Kingdom is wretched indeed after a century of a very costly administration paid for by the poverty-stricken ryots.

Truly as Macaulay said emphatically :

To trade with civilised man is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages ; that would indeed be a dotting wisdom which, in order that India might remain a dependency, would make it a useless and costly dependency, which would keep a hundred millions (now really 221,000,000) of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves.

Should this dotting wisdom continue ?

It is impossible for me to explain in this address all the misapprehensions. I have already explained my views as fully as possible in my papers. These views were at first ridiculed and pooh-poohed till the highest financial authorities, the latest Finance Ministers themselves, admitted the extreme poverty of India. Lord Cromer summed up the situation in these remarkable words in 1882 :

It has been calculated that the average income per head of population in India is not more than Rs. 27 a year. In England the average income per year per head of population was £33 ; in France it was £23 ; in Turkey, which was the poorest country in Europe, it was £4 a head.

Comment is unnecessary. Let us and the Government not live in a fool's paradise, or time may bring disasters to both when it is too late to stop them. This.

poverty is the greatest danger both to us and the rulers. In what shapes and varieties of forms the disease of poverty may attack the body-politic, and bring out and aggregate other evils, it is difficult to tell or foresee, but that there is danger of "most serious order", as the Secretary of State declares, nobody can deny.

INDIAN LOYALTY

Were the people of British India allowed to enjoy the fruits of their own labour and resources, and were fair relations established between the British and Indian peoples, with India contented and prosperous, Britain may defy half-a-dozen Russias. (*Loud cheers.*) Indians will then fight to the last man and to the last rupee for their share, as patriots and not as mercenaries. The rulers will have only to stamp their foot, and millions will spring up to defend the British power and their own hearths and homes. (*Renewed cheering.*)

We, the Congress, are only desirous of supporting Government, and having this important matter of poverty grappled with and settled, we are anxious to prevent "the political danger" of the "most serious order", declared to exist by the Secretary of State himself. We desire that the British connection should endure for a long time to come for the sake of our material and political elevation among the civilised nations of the world. It is no pleasure or profit to us to complain unnecessarily or wantonly about this poverty.

Were we enemies of British rule, our best course would be, not to cry out, but remain silent, and let the mischief take its course till it ends in disaster as it must. But we do not want that disaster, and we therefore cry out, both for our own sake, and for the sake of the rulers. This evil of poverty must be boldly faced and remedied.

This is the question to which we shall have to devote our best energies. We have, no doubt, to contend against many difficulties, but they must be surmounted for everybody's sake.

COSTLY ARMY AND CIVIL SERVICES

The next subject to which I desire to draw your attention is this. We have a large costly European Army and European Civil Services. It is not to be supposed that in these remarks I accept the necessity for them. I take at present the situation as it is. I now submit to the calm consideration of the British people and Government these questions. Is all this European service entirely for the sole benefit of India? Has the United Kingdom no interest or benefit in it? Does not the greatness of, and the greatest benefit to, the United Kingdom arise from its connection with India? Should not the cost of such greatness and great benefits be shared by the United Kingdom in proportion to its means and benefit? Are not these European services especially imposed upon us on the clearly admitted and declared ground of maintaining the British? Let us see what our rulers themselves say.

BRITISH VIEWS ON THE COSTLY INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Lord Beaconsfield said :

We had to decide what was the best step to counteract the efforts Russia was then making, for though war had not been declared, her movements had commenced in Central Asia, and the struggle has commenced which was to decide for ever which power should possess the great gates of India, and that the real question at issue was whether England should possess the gates of her own great Empire in India, and whether the time had not arrived when we could no longer delay that the problem should be solved and in a manner as it has been solved by Her Majesty's Government—Hansard, Vol. 250, p. 1094, 25th February, 1880.

Again, he says :

We resolved that the time has come when this country should acquire the complete command and possession of the gates of the Indian Empire. Let me at least believe that the Peers of England are still determined to uphold not only the Empire but the honour of this country.

Can any words be more emphatic to show the vast and most vital stakes, honour and interests of the United Kingdom?

Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for India, tells us :

We are resolutely determined to maintain our supremacy over our Indian Empire. . . . that among other things, he says, that supremacy rests also upon the maintenance of our European Civil Service, that we rest also upon the magnificent European Force which we maintain in that country.—*Times*, 13th June, 1893. Mansion House Dinner to Lord Roberts.

This again is another emphatic declaration of the vast stakes and interests of the United Kingdom for which the European Services are maintained entirely at our expense.

I shall give one more authority only :

See what a man like Lord Roberts, the symbol of physical force, admits. He says to the London Chamber of Commerce :

I rejoice to learn that you recognise how indissolubly the prosperity of the United Kingdom is bound up with the retention of that vast Eastern Empire.—*Times*, 25th May, 1893. Dinner by the London Chamber of Commerce.

And again he says at Glasgow :

That the retention of our Eastern Empire is essential to the greatness and prosperity of the United Kingdom.—*Times*, 29th July, 1893.

Now, I ask again, that with all such deep, vast and great interest, and the greatness and prosperity of the United Kingdom, essentially depending on the Eastern Empire and indissolubly bound up with it, is it reasonable, is it just and fair, is it British that all the cost of such greatness, glory, and prosperity of the United Kingdom should be entirely to the last farthing thrown upon the wretched Indians, as if the only relations existing between the United Kingdom and India were not of mutual benefit, but of mere masters and slaves as Macaulay pointed out to be deprecated. (*Applause and cries of "No, no" .*)

As for the Navy, the *Times* regards and it is generally admitted that the very existence of Britain itself depends upon the command of the sea. The *Times* says :

They will never forgive the Minister or the Ministry that leaves them weaker at sea than any possible combination of France and another power.

By a telegram I read at Aden, I found Mr. Gladstone "re-affirmed the necessity of British supremacy".

For any war vessels that may be stationed in India for the protection of the interests of both, the expenditure may be fairly shared.

IRELAND AND INDIA CONTRASTED re: FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENT

In the Bill for the better government of Ireland, there are provisions by which Ireland is required to pay a certain share of the Imperial expenditure according to its means, and when necessary to pay a similar share of any extraordinary expenditure, Ireland having all its resources at its own command. Now see how vastly different is our position. Not only will Ireland have all her internal services, Irish or under Irish rules causing no foreign drain from her, but she will also, as she has always enjoyed, continue to enjoy her share in all the gain and glory of the British Empire. Irishmen can be Viceroy, Governors and have any of the appointments in the military or civil services of the Empire, with the additional advantage of a large number of members in Parliament. The Indians, on the other hand, have not only no such share at all in the gains and glory of the British Empire, but are excluded even from the services of their own country, with the consequences of an exhausting foreign drain, of the deplorable evils foretold by Sir John Shore and subjected to the imposition of every farthing of the expenditure. Nor has India any votes in Parliament. And we have now the additional misfortune that the British Cabinet, since the transfer to the Crown, is no longer the independent tribunal to judge between us and the Indian authorities and this adds heavily to our difficulties for obtaining justice and redress, except so far as the sense of justice of the non-official Members of the Parliament helps us.

INDIAN MILITARY EXPENDITURE

There is a strange general misapprehension among the people of the United Kingdom. They do not seem to

know that they have not spent a single shilling either in the formation of the British Indian Empire or in its maintenance and that as far as I know, every farthing is taken from the Indians, with the only exception in my knowledge that Mr. Gladstone with his sense of justice allowed £5,000,000 towards the last Afghan War, which, without having any voice in it, cost India £21,000,000. (*Loud cries of "Shame".*) I cannot blame the people of the United Kingdom generally for this mistake, when even well informed papers give utterances to this most unfortunate fallacy. As for instance, a paper like the *Statist*, in the extract which my friend Mr. Dinshaw E. Wacha gave you last year, says: "Whatever may happen, we must defend India to our last shilling and our last man," while the fact is that they have not spent even their first shilling or any shilling at all (*laughter*) but on the contrary derived benefits in various ways from India of millions on millions every year. ("*Shame.*") Nor have the fighters in creating and maintaining the British Indian Empire been only the British soldier to "the last man". Indian soldiers have done the main work, and if India can be made prosperous and contented as it can be by true statesmanship, the Indian soldier will be ready to fight to "the last man" to defend British power. (*Loud cheers.*)

Britain in fact cannot send to India "to its last man". The very idea is absurd; on the contrary she can draw from India for her European purpose an inexhaustible strength.

Again, the *Statist* says: "We are at this moment spending large sums of money in preparing against a Russian attack." Not a farthing of the British money. Every farthing of these "large sums", which are crushing us, is "imposed" upon the people of British India. Such misleading statements are often made in the English Press to our great injury. ("*Shame.*")

I repeat, then, that we must submit to the just consideration of the British people and Parliament whether it is just and right that they should not pay a fair share,

according to their stakes and means, towards all such expenditure as is incurred for the benefit of both India and the United Kingdom, such expenditure, and the respective share of each, being settled on a peace footing, any extraordinary expenditure against any foreign invasion being also further fairly shared.

Before closing this subject, I may just remark that while leaving necessarily the highest offices of power and control, such as Viceroys and Governors to Europeans, I regard the enormous European Services as a great political and imperial weakness, in critical political times to the British power, as well as the cause, as the present Duke of Devonshire pointed out, of the insufficiency of an efficient administration of the country; and also the main cause of the evils foretold by Sir John Shore, and admitted by the Secretary of State for India, after a hundred years, as a political danger of "a most serious order"; and of the poverty of India.

BRITISH OPINIONS ON THE INDIAN TAXPAYER

I would not say much upon the next subject, as you have had only lately the highest testimonies of two Viceroys and three Secretaries of State for India—of Lord Northbrook and Lord Ripon, and of the Duke of Argyll, Lord Cross, and Lord Kimberley. You remember the debate raised by Lord Northbrook in the House of Lords a few months ago that the Home Military Charges were unfair and unjust, and all the authorities I have named endorsed the complaint. But even the heads of the Indian authorities are so much in terror of the Treasury that Lord Kimberley said :

The India Office has no particular desire that the question should be re-opened and discussed anew, for bitter experience has taught the department that the re-opening of a question of this kind generally results in the imposition of additional charges.

Is this one other disadvantage of the transfer to the Crown? Lord Kimberley hit the nail on the head why India was so unfairly treated (and same may be applied to such other treatment of India by the Indian authorities themselves) when he said :

The reasons why proposals that must throw fresh burdens on the Government of India are so frequently made in the House of Commons is that those who make them know that their own pockets will not suffer in the desire to make things agreeable and comfortable. (*Laughter.*) The taxpayers of the country exercise no check upon such proposals, and the consequence is that charges are sometimes imposed upon the Government of India which that Government thinks unjust and unnecessary.

It must be borne in mind that charges "imposed on the Government of India" means the suffering party is the poor taxpayer of India.

The Duke of Argyll characterises these charges as "unjust and illegal tribute to England". But mark the words of Lord Cross: "I am certain that in the course of a few years the Indian people will force us to do them justice." This is just the feature "to be forced to do justice" which I always deplore. We desire that all necessary reforms and acts of justice should be spontaneous on the part of Britain, in good grace and in good time as gifts claiming our gratitude, and not to wait till "forced", with loss of grace from the giver and the loss of gratitude from the receiver. (*Hear, hear.*)

I offer my thanks to Lord Northbrook and other Lords for that debate, though yet barren of any result. But we may fairly hope that such debate must sooner or later produce good results. It is like a good seed sown and will fructify.

Here are some smaller items: The cost of the India Office Building of about half-a-million, of the Royal Engineering College of £134,000, and of other buildings is all cast on India. The cost of the Colonial Office Building, £100,000, is paid from the British Exchequer. The India Office Establishment, etc., about £230,000 a year, is all imposed on India, while the £41,000 of the Colonial Office and £168,000 for Colonial Services are paid from the British Exchequer. The Public Debt of India (excluding Railway and Productive Works) is incurred in creating and preserving the British power, but all our cries to give us at least the benefit of a British guarantee have been in vain, with the curious suicidal effort of showing to the world

that the British Government itself has no confidence in the stability of its own power in India. (*Hear, hear.*)

In 1870, Mr. Gladstone declared India to be "too much burdened", when the Annual Expenditure was £39,000,000; what expression can be used now when, with an extremely poor income, the burden now is nearly 75 per cent. heavier, or Rs. 68,000,000 this year.

SEPARATION OF EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS

Passing on to the other subjects, I hope the separation of Executive and Judicial functions will receive attention as its necessity has been recognised. We have to persevere for this as well as for other parts of our programme, bearing in mind one great difficulty we have to contend with. Unfortunately the Indian authorities when they determine to do or not to do a thing under the notion of preserving prestige and strength, as if any false prestige can be a strength, disregard even Resolutions or Acts of Parliament itself, and resort to every device to carry their own point of view. (*Loud cries of "Shame".*) We cannot expect Parliament to watch Indian affairs from day to day, and therein lies the impunity and immunity of the Indian administration.

I shall refer to only two instances: First, the case of the misleadingly called "The Statutory Service", and what in reality was created out of, and as a part and parcel of, the Covenanted Civil Service. I can speak with some authority, for I was the very proposer of the Memorial of the East India Association to Sir Stafford Northcote which resulted in the Clause of the Act of 1870. But the Indian authorities would not have it. They moved heaven and earth to thwart it; it is a long and a sad story for the good name of Britain, and they never rested till they made the Statute a dead letter, though it still stands on the Statute-Book of the Imperial Parliament. (*"Shame".*) However, I hear with pleasure, and I hope it is true, that a disposition has arisen, for which I understand Lord Kimberley is to be thanked, to redress this glaring and unfortunate wrong—unfortunate for British prestige, for

British honour and British good faith, and I do hope that the Government would do this redress ungrudgingly, with good grace, completeness and generosity. This instance illustrates another unfortunate phase of the Administration.

INDIAN FOREST SERVICE

The Forest Department is recruited by examinations in England and by selection in India. Such selection is not based upon a Resolution or Act of Parliament, but upon the will of the authorities and consisting of Europeans. The Government of India in Resolution No. 18 F, of 29th July 1891, have described them as untrained and uncovenanted officers, who have been unconditionally appointed in past years, and yet they are ordered in the regular Indian Forest Service; while those Native Civilians, created and backed by an Act of Parliament, as distinctly belonging to the Covenanted Civil Service, are excluded from that Civil Service to which the Act distinctly appointed them. Can such difference of treatment of Europeans and Indians preserve British prestige for honour and justice, and would it increase or diminish the existing attachment of the Indians to British rule?

THE STATE REGULATION OF VICE

The second instance was the practical disregard of the Resolution of the House of Commons about the State regulation of vice. But in this case there were vigilant watchers like Mrs. Butler, Mr. Stansfeld, M.P., Mr. Stuart, M.P., and others, and they did not allow the Resolution to become a dead letter. In this case also I am glad to find that the Indian authorities now mean to give loyal effect to the Resolution, and well may they do so, for the sake of the British good name, fame, and prestige, for morality of every kind upon which mainly British strength and influence rest.

THE CURRENCY QUESTION

On the Currency Question I need not dwell much. My views are not unknown to you. Now that the Sherman Law is repealed by the United States, we may hope to see

a settled condition in time. No amount of currency, jugglery or devices in this country could have any influence (except that of creating troubles in the country itself, as has happened) on the loss in the remittances to England for Home charges which must be paid in gold, and will fluctuate with the rise or fall of gold in the United Kingdom. As if this crushing loss was not enough for the wretched taxpayers, further burdens were laid to make things agreeable and comfortable with other people's money as Lord Kimberley would say, of high exchange to the European officials, and the further most unwarranted payment of £138,000 to the banks, with whose transactions in profits or loss the taxpayer has no connection whatever. (*"Shame, shame."*) Some strange precedents are made in this matter to silence opposition and to support banks at the expense of the taxpayers, which will lead to serious troubles in the future. Should not the millowners and other concerns also claim compensation for the dislocation of their industry or transactions by the currency action of the Government, as Government itself admits to have caused such dislocation? Would the British Exchequer have paid any such money to the British banks? Such a thing would never have been thought of. The utmost that is done in any crisis is allowing the Bank of England to issue more notes under strong restrictions. Had the banks made profits instead of loss, would they have handed them to the taxpayer? Then it would have been called the reward of shrewdness, foresight, enterprise, etc., etc.

The whole currency troubles from which India is suffering, and which are so peculiar to India and so deplorable to the Indian taxpayer, and from which no other silver-using country suffers, is one of the best illustrations and object-lessons, and proof of the soundness of Sir John Shore's prophecy about the evil consequences of the present unnatural system of a remote foreign dominion, or as the Secretary of State called the danger of "a most serious order".

The currency muddle will necessitate new taxation. The usual easy and unchecked resource of putting off the

evil day by borrowing is already resorted to, and in the spirit of keeping things agreeable and comfortable to those who have votes in Parliament, there is danger of increase in the salt tax. I do hope that Government will have some moral courage and some mercy upon the wretched taxpayer, and reduce even the salt tax by re-imposing the cotton duties. Not that by this means India will be saved a pie from the addition of burdens, but that a little better able shoulders will have to bear them, or as Lord Salisbury once coolly put it, that as India must be bled, the lancet should be directed to the parts where there was at least sufficient blood, not to those which are already feeble from the want of it.

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE NATIVE STATES.

Another subject of our future work to which I need only touch now is the relations of the Government with the Native States. There is much unnecessary irritation and dissatisfaction where there ought to be the pleassest harmony with much greater devoted loyalty than what even now really exists. And it is also a great mistake for a foreign power not to draw the military capacity and spirit of the country to their own side by giving it a fair career and interest in their own service. Make the military races feel it to their advantage and interest to be loyal to the British rule instead of keeping them alienated from the Government.

FELLOW-FEELING AND COMMON NATIONALITY

I need not say more upon our future work, as various Resolutions of importance will be placed before you for your consideration and I am sure you will deliberate with that moderation and fairness for which you have already distinguished yourselves and acquired just credit, and for which I offer you my hearty congratulations. You recognise, I have no doubt, that at every turn you have yet serious questions to grapple with and much work to do.

Any one who has watched my public career must have seen that my main underlying principle and the desire of my heart is to promote, as far as I can, good fellow-feeling.

among all my countrymen. (*Loud applause.*) And I have no doubt that all the educated and thinking men and all true friends of our own country will continue to do all that lies in their power to bring about stronger and stronger friendly ties of common nationality, fellow-feeling and due deference to each other's views and feelings amongst the whole people of our country.

GOVERNMENT AND LAWLESSNESS

Government must be firm and just in case of any unfortunate differences ; as far as Government are concerned their duty is clearly to put down with a strong hand any lawlessness or disturbance of the peace, no matter who the parties concerned may be. They can only stand, as they ought, on the only sure and right foundation of even-handed justice to all, and cannot allow any one to take the law into his own hands ; the only wise policy is to adhere to their declared policy of strict neutrality and equal protection and justice to all creeds. (*Hear, hear.*)

I was much pleased to read in the papers that cordial conferences had been held between Muhammadans and Hindus in various places to devise means to prevent any deplorable occurrences happening in the future.

HARMONY AND UNION BETWEEN DIFFERENT RACES

Looking back to the past as my own personal experience of my life, and as far back as I know of earlier days, at least on my side of India, I feel a congratulation that all associations and societies of members of all creeds have worked together in harmony and union, without any consideration of class or creed in all matters concerning our common national public and political interests. No doubt, latterly, even in such common matters differences of views have arisen and will arise, but such differences of views, when genuine, are healthy, just as is the case in the United Kingdom itself with its two political parties. (*Hear, hear.*)

What makes me still more gratified and look forward hopefully in the future is that our Congress has not only worked so far in the union and concord of all classes and

creeds but has taken care to provide that such harmony should continue in the future. As early as in the Congress at Allahabad of 1888, you passed this Resolution (XIII.):

That no subject shall be passed for discussion by the Subjects Committee, or allowed to be discussed at any Congress by the President thereof, to the introduction of which the Hindu or Muhammadan delegates as a body object unanimously or nearly unanimously; and that if, after the discussion of any subject which has been admitted for discussion, it shall appear that all the Hindu or all the Muhammadan delegates as a body are unanimously or nearly unanimously opposed to the Resolution which it is proposed to pass thereon, such Resolution shall be dropped; provided that this rule shall refer only to subjects in regard to which the Congress has not already definitely pronounced an opinion.

As I have already said, the highest wish of my heart is that all the people of India should regard and treat each other as fellow-countrymen, with fellow-feeling for the good of all. (*Applause.*)

We may, I am convinced, rest fully assured that whatever political or national benefit we may acquire will in one or other way benefit all classes (*hear, hear*), the benefit of each taking various forms. The interests of us all are the same. We are all in the same boat. We must sink or swim together. Government cannot but treat us all alike. It is unreasonable for us to expect from them, and unjust and unwise for them to show, any undue favour to any particular class or community. The only solid foundation for them is justice and impartiality, and the only just demand from us also can only be justice and impartiality. (*Loud applause.*)

If the country is prosperous, then if one gets scope in one walk of life, another will have in another walk of life. As our Indian saying goes: "If there is water in the well it will come to the cistern." If we have the well of prosperity we shall be able to draw each our share from it. But if the well is dry we must all go without any at all.

FOUNDATIONS OF BRITISH POWER IN INDIA

A word for the basis upon which the strength of British power stands. Britain can hold India, or any one

country can hold another, by moral force only. You can build up an empire by arms or ephemeral brute physical force, but you can preserve it by the eternal moral forces only. Brute force will, some time or another, break down; righteousness alone is everlasting. (*Cheers.*) Well and truly has Lord Ripon said: "That the British power and influence rests upon the conviction of our good faith more than upon the valour of our soldiers or the reputation of our arms." (*Applause.*) Mr. Gladstone says:

It is the predominance of that moral force for which I heartily pray in the deliberations of this House and the conduct of our whole public policy, for I am convinced that upon that predominance depends that which should be the first object of all our desires, as it is of all our daily official prayers, namely, that union of heart and sentiment which constitutes the truest basis of strength at home, and therefore both of strength and good fame throughout the civilised world.—*Debates, 9th August 1892. (Applause.)*

And here is a remarkable instance cited by Mr. Gladstone of a people of a different race becoming attached even to the much despised Turkish rule. How much more will the people of India, if contented and prosperous, become attached to the rule of such a people as the British? Referring to Lebanon, Mr. Gladstone said:

Owing to the wise efforts of Lord Dufferin and others about thirty years ago local management was established since which the province has become contented to the Turkish Empire.

Lord Roberts, the apostle of British strong arm to maintain British power, and though much imbued with many of the prejudices against the progress of the Indians, as a true soldier, admits without hesitation what he considers as the only solid foundation upon which British strength must for ever rest. He says:

But however efficient and well equipped the army of India may be, were it indeed absolute perfection and were its numbers considerably more than they are at present, our greatest strength must ever rest on the firm base of a united and contented India.

True and more statesmanlike words could not be uttered. Permit me to give one more extract. Mr. Gladstone, referring to Irish Home Rule, said:

There can be no nobler spectacle than that which we think is now drawing upon us, the spectacle of a nation deliberately set on the removal of injustice, deliberately determined to break, not through terror and not in haste, but under the sole influence of duty and honour, determined to break with whatever remains still existing of an evil tradition, and determined in that way at once to pay a debt of justice and to consult by a bold, wise, and good act its own interests and its own honour.

Am I at all unreasonable in hoping that such noble statesmanship, honour, and good faith of the British people will, in fullness of time, also extend to India similar justice? I shall hope as long as I live.

INDIAN NATIONALITY

Let us always remember that we are all children of our mother country. Indeed, I have never worked in any other spirit than that I am an Indian (*cheers*), and owe duty to my country and all my countrymen. Whether I am a Hindu, a Muhammadan, a Parsi, a Christian, or of any other creed, I am above all an Indian. Our country is India; our nationality is Indian. (*Loud cheers.*)

The question for us, especially a body like this, who have received the blessings of education, is: How are we to perform our duty to our country? Certainly no one requires to be taught that no great cause or object can ever be accomplished without great sacrifices—personal and pecuniary. We can never succeed with the British people by mere declamations. We must show that we believe in the justice of our cause by our earnestness and self-sacrifice. (*Hear, hear.*)

LEARN TO MAKE SACRIFICES

I desire now to impress upon my countrymen with all the earnestness I am capable of to prepare themselves for sacrifices. We observe every day what sacrifices the British people make for attaining any object, great or small and how persistently they stick to it; and among the lessons which we are learning from them let us learn this particular one, with the double advantage and effect of showing that Indians have public spirit and love of their country, and also proving that they are earnest in what they are asking. (*Applause.*)

ORGANISED EFFORTS

Our work for the amelioration of our country and for obtaining all the rights and benefits of British citizenship will go on increasing, and it is absolutely necessary that our organisation, both here and in the United Kingdom, should be much improved and made complete. Without good organisation no important work can be successfully done; and that means much pecuniary and personal sacrifice. We must remember the Congress meets once a year. The General Secretaries and the Standing Committees have to carry out the details and inform the Circles of the work and resolutions of the Congress.

CONGRESS WORK IN LONDON

But the most important and national work formulated by the Congress has to be done with watchfulness, day after day, in London by your British Committee. (*Cheers.*) And, further, by your Resolution XII. of the Seventh Session,

you urged them (the Committee) to widen henceforth the sphere of their usefulness by interesting themselves, not only in those questions dealt with by the Congress, but in all Indian matters submitted to them and properly vouched for in which any principle accepted by the Congress is involved. (*Renewed cheering.*)

Fancy what this means. Why, it is another India Office! You have put all India's every-day work upon the shoulders of the Committee. It becomes exceedingly necessary for efficient and good work to have some paid person or persons to devote time to study the merits of all the representations which pour in with every mail, or by telegrams, before any action can be taken on them. It is in the United Kingdom that all our great fights are to be fought, all our national and imperial questions are to be settled, and it is to our British Committee in London that we have to look for the performance of all this responsible and arduous work, with the unfortunate feature that we have to contend against many adverse influences, prepossessions and misunderstandings. We have to make the British people unlearn a good deal.

On the other hand, we have this hopeful feature also that we have not only many British friends, but also Anglo-Indians, who, in the true spirit of justice and of the gratitude to the country to which they owe their past career and future provision, appreciate the duty they owe to India, and are desirous to help us, and to preserve the British Empire by the only certain means of justice, the honour and righteousness of the British people, and by the contentment and prosperity of India.

You know well how much we owe to the present English members of our Committee, Sir William Wedderburn (*three cheers for Sir William Wedderburn*), Mr. Hume, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Adam, Mr. Schwann, M.P., and Mr. McLaren, M.P. If we want all such help at the fountain-head of power without which we cannot do much good, we must take care to supply them always, promptly and accurately, all necessary sinews of war. (*Hear, hear, and applause.*)

CONGRESS ORGAN "INDIA "

Then there is the journal "INDIA ", without which our work will not be half as efficient as with it. It is an absolute necessity as an instrument and part of the organisation. Every possible effort must be made to give it the widest circulation possible both here and in the United Kingdom. I wish it could be made weekly instead of monthly.

With proper effort ten thousand copies should be easily disposed of here as a beginning, and we must do this.

DADABHAI'S ELECTION TO THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

This is the first opportunity I have of meeting you after the Congress of 1886, over which I had the honour to preside at Calcutta. Let me now thank you personally for your constant remembrance of me, for your unceasing encouragement, and for your two most kind and gratifying resolutions passed at the last two sessions as representatives of every class and creed, and almost wholly consisting of Hindu and Muhammadan delegates,

and each delegate being elected by and representative of the whole mixed community of the place he represents, on the basis of common interest and nationality. I must beg your indulgence to record those Resolutions in this address. The first Resolution (XIV.) passed by the Seventh Congress in 1891, while I was a candidate, is this :—

Resolved, that this Congress hereby puts formally on record its high esteem and deep appreciation of the great services which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has rendered, during more than a quarter of a century, to the cause of India, and it expresses its unshaken confidence in him, and its earnest hope that he may prove successful at the coming election, in his candidature for Central Finsbury; and at the same time tenders, on behalf of the vast population it represents, India's most cordial acknowledgments to all in England whether in Central Finsbury or elsewhere, who have aided or may aid him to win a seat in the House of Commons.

I need not say how right earnestly Central Finsbury listened to your appeal and fulfilled your hope, for which we owe them our most unstinted thanks, and to all those who helped in or out of Central Finsbury. (*Loud applause.*)

I may here once more express my hearty thanks to many ladies and gentlemen who worked hard for my election. After I was elected, you passed the second Resolution (XVI.) in the last Session. I may point here to the significant incident that in that Congress there was, I think, only one Parsi delegate and he even not the delegate of Parsis, but of all classes of the people. This Resolution was :

Resolved that this Congress most respectfully and cordially tenders, on behalf of the vast population it represents, India's most heartfelt thanks to the Electors of Central Finsbury for electing Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, their Member in the House of Commons, and it again puts on record its high esteem and deep appreciation of the services which that gentleman has rendered to this country, reiterates its unshaken confidence in him, and looks upon him as India's representative in the House of Commons.

DADABHAI RETURNS THANKS TO ALL INDIANS

Let me also now take this opportunity, on Indian soil, to tender my most heartfelt thanks for the telegrams, letters and addresses of congratulation which I received

from all parts and classes of India—literally I may say from the prince to the peasant, from members of all creeds, from Hindus, Muhammadans, Christians, Parsis, from Ceylon, from the High Priest of Buddhists, and Buddhists, and other residents from the Cape, British Guiana, Australia, and in short from every part of the British Empire, where there were Indian residents. Ladies and Gentlemen, put aside my personality and let me join in your rejoicings as an Indian in the great event in Indian annals of an Indian finding his way in the Imperial Parliament. (*Loud and prolonged cheering.*)

And lastly, beginning from the distant Western Gate of India, where the Indian residents of Aden, of all creeds, gave me a most hearty reception, then the great portal of India, the dear old city of my birth, gave me a most magnificent welcome with its never-ceasing kindness towards me, Poona doing her best to vie with Bombay, and through the Punjab so splendidly; and this series of welcomes now ending in your extraordinary one which I am utterly unable to describe. Is there any reward more grand and more gratifying than the esteem, the joy with my joy, the sorrow with my sorrow, and above all the "unshaken confidence" of my fellow-countrymen and country-women of our grand, old, beloved country?

I may refer to an incident which, as it is satisfactory, is also very significant of the real desire of the British people to do justice to India. The congratulations on my election from all parts of the United Kingdom also were as hearty and warm as we could desire, and expressing satisfaction that an Indian would be able to voice the wants and aspirations of India in the House of Commons.

LONDON CONGRESS

I can assure the Congress that, as I hope and wish, if you will pay an early visit to the United Kingdom and hold a session there, you will obtain a kind and warm reception from its peoples. And you will by such direct and personal appeal to the British Nation, accomplish a vast amount of good. (*Hear, hear.*)

FAITH IN BRITISH FAIR PLAY AND JUSTICE

Our fate and our future are in our own hands. If we are true to ourselves and to our country and make all the necessary sacrifices for our elevation and amelioration, I for one have not the shadow of a doubt that in dealing with such justice-loving, fair-minded people as the British, we may rest fully assured that we shall not work in vain. It is this conviction which has supported me against all difficulties. I have never faltered in my faith in the British character and have always believed that the time will come when the sentiments of the British Nation and our Gracious Sovereign proclaimed to us in our Great Charter of the Proclamation of 1858 will be realised (*applause*) viz., "In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our best reward." And let us join in the prayer that followed this hopeful declaration of our Sovereign :

May the God of all power grant to us and to those in authority under us strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people.

DADABHAI'S EXHORTATION

My last prayer and exhortation to the Congress and to all my countrymen is : Go on united and earnest, in concord and harmony, with moderation, with loyalty to the British rule and patriotism towards our country, and success is sure to attend our efforts for our just demands and the day, I hope, is not distant when the world will see the noblest spectacle of a great nation like the British holding out the hand of true fellow-citizenship and of justice to the vast mass of humanity of this great and ancient land of India with benefits and blessings to the human race. (*Loud and prolonged cheering.*)

Tenth Congress—Madras—1894

MR. ALFRED WEBB, M.P.

FRRIENDS AND FELLOW-SUBJECTS,—You call me to the presidency of the tenth meeting of the Indian National Congress. Thanking you for the honour, I proceed to discharge the duties of the post under a sense of its privileges and responsibilities.

OBJECTS OF THE CONGRESS

The objects of these Congresses cannot be better stated than in the words of your first President :

The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the more earnest workers in [your] country's cause in all parts of the empire ; the eradication by direct friendly intercourse of all possible race, creed, or national prejudices amongst all lovers of [your] country ; and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in [your] Lord Ripon's ever memorable reign ; the authoritative record, after this has been carefully elicited by the fullest discussion, of the matured opinions of the educated classes in India on some of the more important and pressing of the social questions of the day ; the determination of the lines upon, and the methods by which, during the next twelve months, it is desirable for native politicians to labour in the public interests.

DIFFICULTIES BEFORE THE CONGRESS

The ends you have in view are similar to those of politicians in other quarters of the globe. The difficulties before you are however greater. Elsewhere politicians have to deal principally with homogeneous populations, to whom, at least in theory, equal political right may at once be accorded ; you have largely to work for those who yet have to pass through a long process of assimilation and elevation. All the greater necessity that in assemblages such as this you should set yourselves to the task. All the greater necessity that a deaf ear should be turned to

doctrines of despair. The question is not regarding the difficulties, but as to whether or not the difficulties are to be faced ; and if to be faced, the sooner the better. And it is alone by and through organisations such as yours that they can be faced.

It is at the same time necessary to bear in mind that you stand at the most critical period of a people's history. Your populations, heretofore supine, are awakening to consciousness and new hopes, whilst they may not as yet have fully acquired habits of self-restraint and sentiments of responsibility. Mistakes are certain to be made, and are sure to be attributed by opponents, not to their true source—former conditions, but to the awakening, the ennobling process. We must be prepared to meet misrepresentations and calumny. We must take heed that in our leading we give no just cause for accusation.

PAST WORK OF THE CONGRESS

You have met at Bombay twice, at Calcutta twice, at Allahabad twice, at Nagpur, at Lahore ; you now meet at Madras for the second time. But seventy-two representatives attended your first assembly. The numbers gradually increased to over 1,000 at Bombay, since which meeting they have, on your own motion, for concentration of effectiveness, been restricted to from about 700 to 1,000. Your proceedings have been conducted with dignity, fairness, courtesy, and tact.

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE CONGRESS

Your Presidents hitherto have been distinguished men, mainly, as was right, from amongst your own people, and representing, as they should, some of the principal races and religions of India. Most eminent amongst these Presidents was Dadabhai Naoroji, not only because of his great abilities and his life-long services to his country, but because of the position he occupies as your only native representative in the Imperial Parliament. The electors of Finsbury have done themselves honour in returning him. As to your other native Presidents, the ability of their

addresses and the manner in which they conducted your proceedings showed their fitness for the trusts confided to them. The lamented George Yule of Calcutta, almost one of yourselves, presided at your fourth Congress, Sir William Wedderburn conducted the fifth. I have styled Mr. Naoroji your only *native* representative in the Imperial Parliament. In Sir William Wedderburn you have another representative equally zealous and devoted—one of the faithful few whose clear conceptions of equality and justice have been unobscured by long official service. There is another name which, although not on the list of your Presidents, cannot be omitted in recalling, however slightly, your past proceedings—that of Charles Bradlaugh, “the friend and champion of India”. He attended and addressed your fifth Congress. The report of the sixth is formally dedicated to his memory. You never lost a better or an abler friend. Few men were ever so sincerely mourned by a larger proportion of the human race.

MR. WEBB'S QUALIFICATIONS TO PRESIDE

Having already placed in the chair two Scotchmen, you have now chosen an Irishman. Doubtless, after a becoming interval with native Presidents, you will call an Englishman. My nationality is the principal ground for my having been selected. I have none of the brilliant qualifications of my predecessors. On your kind invitation I take the position that was intended for a great fellow-countryman of my own. However I do not question the fitness of your choice, for I am representative in several respects. I was nurtured in the conflict against American slavery. In the words of William Lloyd Garrison, the founder of the movement: “My country is the world; my countrymen are all mankind.” To aid in the elevation of my native land has been the endeavour of my riper years. In the words of Daniel O’Connell:

My sympathies are not confined to my own green island. I am a friend to civil and religious liberty all over the world.

I hate tyranny and oppression wherever practised by my own Government, for them I am in a measure

responsible. I have felt the bitterness of subjection in my own country. I am a member of the Irish Parliamentary Party. I am one of the Indian Parliamentary Committees. I am a Dissenter, proud of the struggles of my Quaker forefathers for freedom of thought and action; a Protestant returned by a Catholic constituency—a Protestant living in a Catholic country, testifying against craven fears of a return to obsolete religious bitterness and intolerance—fears in your country and in mine worked upon to impede the progress of liberty.

To be placed in this chair is the highest honour to which I can ever aspire.

That I have not resided in India is no disqualification. Free peoples are within their own borders the best judges of their own affairs. But where are concerned the interests of a large population governed by a dominant class, the members of that class, whose apparent interests lie in a continuance of that domination, cannot as a rule fairly judge. There are rare exceptions, such as Sir William Wedderburn, but, generally speaking, their vision is obscured by prejudices. West Indian slavery would never have been abolished by West Indian planters, nor American slavery by Southern Whites. Catholics would never have been emancipated in Ireland, the Church would not have been disestablished, or the franchise extended, by that class there under present institutions.

DUTIES OF ENGLISH OFFICIALS TOWARDS INDIA

Nothing in what I have said or intend to say must however be taken as implying want of appreciation of the character and services of numbers of my fellow-citizens, whose lives have been and are given to the administration and government of India. They were doubtless at first attracted to the service solely as a career in life. But residence here, sympathy with your people, and a sense of duty rapidly impel to higher motives. They become sincerely anxious for your welfare and devoted to what they believe your highest good. Never has more conscience been brought to the government of a conquered country.

We here are not set against them unless, indeed, they are determined to set themselves against us. The services of men of their training, temper and turn of mind may, perhaps for generations to come, be necessary. They are to be honoured and respected in their sphere. But they must not impede or prevent the gradual application of principles other than those laid down by statesmen of the first rank fully half-a-century ago to the government of this country. I might perhaps have been more affected than I have been by the attitude and language of many of them regarding your country and your people, were it not that it is such as I have been accustomed to hear from the same class in Ireland towards my country and my people. If the anticipations of those regarding your capacities and your future are as fully belied as have been the anticipations of those regarding our capacities and our future, you may rest satisfied. Closely allied, as they have been, to us in Ireland in blood and religion, their efforts to govern independent of Irish opinion resulted in failure. How much less likely is it that they can succeed here without availing themselves of your assistance more largely than heretofore.

INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER AND TRAINING

In our efforts for reform and constitutional liberty, much will depend upon individual character and training; upon the extent to which we wisely administer the powers we have. The English are not naturally better or braver than other peoples. They owe their success partly to high average reliability and a high sense of duty. What they personally undertake they usually perform. Like others, they are moved by selfish considerations; but having, in politics of administrative office, once engaged for the public weal, they are not apt to neglect it for private interests; they can rely upon each other. Let us take pattern by them in these respects.

PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST IN INDIAN AFFAIRS.

While most anxious not to implicate your cause with Irish politics, or the relation between Great Britain and

Ireland, I may occasionally illustrate your affairs by reference to my own country. Your interests are in fact closely involved in some effectual settlement of the Irish question. One of your principal and most just complaints is that no sufficient attention is given to your affairs in Parliament. Whilst months are allotted to the consideration of the British Budget, a few hours are grudged to yours. Parliament is paralysed with work. It has undertaken functions it cannot perform. Three separate Parliaments had enough to do to manage the affairs of England, Scotland, and Ireland. They were merged into one when the population of the United Kingdom was only fifteen millions. That population has now risen to thirty-eight millions. Parliament has, moreover, undertaken to care for your two hundred and eighty millions. The sphere of law is becoming both wider and more minute. Surely, Parliament ought to be more of an Imperial, less of a local, assembly. For generations to come, England, the heart of the Empire, must have the preponderating influence in Imperial Councils. That we grant. You, who are Indian, and I, who am Irish, trust that our Imperial rights will not suffer from that preponderating English influence. But at present the Imperial Parliament is occupied largely with the affairs of under five millions of people, and ministries rise and fall on the question of Ireland rather than great Imperial interests. The entire Empire is concerned in the speedy settlement of the Irish question.

BENEFITS OF IMPERIAL UNITY

We hold to Imperial unity, undisputed and intact. To question this would be idle, nor do we question it, and we do not desire to question it. We believe that the period of small states—too often a burden alike to themselves and to the world, with their dissensions and wars—is rapidly passing away and that a better era is dawning when, under the ægis of immensely powerful states, the people can rest secure and enjoy real liberty. The series of events by which this change has been wrought is sufficiently painful, often unutterably shocking. We

may well turn with horror from the record. I for one would rather be descended from those who rest in the graves of the conquered than from those who rode with victors. There is no true glory in mere domination. In public places and museums I turn with shame from the pitiful trophies torn from subjected peoples. We must however accept the conditions of these changes. Let us enjoy their benefits, which are many. After all, the external prestige of nationality is not the important consideration. Individual liberty, the wise administration of local affairs, the educating of a responsible population, these are of far greater consequence. And Imperial unity cannot realise its full strength and will not fulfil its true functions until all are trained to enjoy these benefits, and these benefits are extended to all. What man of ordinary intelligence could prefer Russian despotism to British freedom? British power in India will remain invulnerable against foreign aggrandisement so long as you believe that with the spread of modern ideas and education, which are largely due to British rule, will come an extension of English liberty.

INDIAN NATIONALITY

There is no possibility of turning back. Once imbue nations with aspirations for progress and enlightenment, and they must go forwards towards liberty. For fifty years the Anglo-Indian Government has been urging you to educate yourselves, to imbibe principles of constitutional liberty, to obliterate old divisions, to break down caste prejudices, to rise to the level of British citizenship, and unite for the good of a common country. Taking up Sir William Hunter's *History of the Indian Peoples*, the first sentence that rivetted my attention was one in which it is desired that the Anglo-Indian schools should "become the nurseries of a self-respecting nation". The towers of a University were the first object that met my gaze the morning after my arrival in India. Nationality has well been defined in your debates as

the aggregate of those who are citizens of one country [one definite geographical unit] subordinate to one power, subject to one supreme legislature, taxed by one authority, influenced for well

and woe by one system of administration, urged by like impulses to secure like rights and to be relieved of like burdens.

. . . . It has for its central stock, like the trunk of a tree, the people who have for ages and generations settled and domiciled in a country with more or less ethnic identity at the bottom, and more or less unified by being continually subjected to identical environment and to the inevitable process of assimilation.

Those who accept any such definitions circle in narrow grooves of thought if they believe that such nationality is inimical to Imperial strength and unity. It may in truth be its outcome and its crown.

WHAT ARE POLITICS ?

Politics are amongst the most ennobling, most comprehensive spheres of human activity and none should eventually be excluded from their exercise. There is much that is ludicrous, much that is sad, much that is deplorable about them. Yet they remain, and ever will remain, the most effective field upon which to work for the good of our fellows. The political atmosphere, that which we here hope to breathe, is one into which no thought of "greed or lust, or low ambition" should enter. We desire the good of all. We work for all. No class, however lowly, however despised, must be shut out from our sympathies and our endeavours—from the expectations of that great future towards which we all yearn. We desire not alone the brotherhood of man, but the brotherhood and sisterhood of men and women. In proportion as men and women sympathise with each other, take part in each other's pursuits, and strive for the common weal, in such proportion is public life elevated and purified. Amongst women are some of your best and most earnest friends in the United Kingdom.

THE ARMS ACT

Admitting the paramount necessity for the maintenance of the unity of the Empire, we know that all questions relating to armed forces of the Crown must be treated with circumspection. We must weigh well our words and the difficulties of the situation.

In Ireland, during most of my lifetime it has been a penal offence to carry them without license, and licenses are strictly guarded. In India, you rest under closer restrictions. Some modification of the rules under the Arms Act is necessary

so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste, or colour; to ensure the liberal concession wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle, or crops; and to make all licences granted under the revised rules of lifelong tenure revocable only on proof of misuse and valid throughout the provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued.

With us the prohibitions are an insult to the soil; with you, to the race.

POVERTY OF INDIA

Nothing is more striking in considering the condition of India than its poverty compared with the wealth of the rest of the Western world, especially with the United Kingdom. (The riches of Great Britain are so enormous that the poverty of Ireland scarcely affects the general average.) The mean annual income of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom has been estimated at £33-14s.; that of the people of India, at from Rs. 20 to Rs. 27. Mr. Fowler, in his ministerial statement this year, dwelt upon the comparative lightness of burthen of Indian taxation compared with that in the United Kingdom, forgetting that 5 per cent. on an income of Rs. 20 is a much heavier burthen than $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on £33. It is impossible, upon any basis of fair play, to justify debiting you with so many large items, such as the India Office and India Office expenses, recruiting depots, loss on exchange, and the like, which really form a portion of the British Home Charges. If the maintenance of the Indian Empire is so essential to British prestige and greatness, if the honour and glory are to be Britain's, surely she, not you, should bear the heavy burthen. She does not attempt to collect similar charges from the Colonies.

The aggregate *annual savings* of the United Kingdom in the years between 1840 and 1888 have been estimated

at £110,000,000, or over £300,000 a day. Such accumulations of wealth, combined with parsimonious dealings with poorer peoples, are irreconcilable with real belief in the precepts of righteousness.

The expenditure upon the army in India, which in 1882-83 stood at Rx. 18,359,000 (including Rx. 17,000 for Afghanistan and Rx. 1,308,000 for Egypt), had in 1893 risen by 27 per cent. to Rx. 23,877,000. Any advantages to be derived from this increased expenditure have not been shared in alike by native and by British troops. The pensions of European officers have been raised 37 per cent.; of native officers only 11 per cent. Thirteen per cent. more per man is spent upon the British rank and file; 4 per cent. less per man upon the native rank and file.

Your taxes spent abroad have risen from Rx. 17,369,000 in 1882 by 31 per cent. to Rx. 22,911,000 in 1892. In the former year they amounted to 23 per cent., in the latter to 25 per cent., of your total expenditure. No country could permanently afford such a drain. These increases are not materially due to alterations in the rates of exchange.

These startling facts demand grave consideration east and west of Suez, apart from the daily deteriorating condition of agriculture generally. I am not competent enough to speak on the state of your peasantry, but so far as all accounts go, official included, there are strong grounds to apprehend danger from the agricultural condition of the country. I am aware that this problem constantly engages the attention of the Supreme Government, and it is to be hoped that it will take a new departure in its policy of land revenue. Mere palliatives will never do. A judicious and statesmanlike survey of the existing situation should enable it to devise a satisfactory remedy, whatever action may be taken to free the impoverished peasantry from the hands of money-lenders will go a great way to ameliorate their condition. And Government itself should modify its cast-iron system of exacting revenue at dates at which the cultivators are least prepared to discharge the State dues. We must,

however, not take a gloomy view of the situation. If you have greater difficulties to contend with than we in Ireland, you will remember that your population has been increasing, whilst ours has been reduced by over 40 per cent. within the past half-century. Whilst you have leeway to make up in education and material advancement, your relative progress has been and is out of all proportion to ours.

REFORM OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

The justice of, and necessity for, adequate representation in our superior and local Councils is apparent, and naturally claims much of your attention. The administrative mutilation of the manifest intentions of Parliament in framing the Indian Councils Act is much to be deplored. I see that complaints have been made in every province where the enlarged Councils are established; that the distribution of seats for representation of the people is most unsatisfactory; and that while some interests are over-represented, other important interests are not represented at all. This is not in accordance with the expressed views of British statesmen on both sides of the House when the Bill was discussed. Mr. Gladstone said :

I believe I am justified in looking forward, not merely to a nominal, but to a real living representation of the people of India.

Lord Salisbury was no less emphatic :

If we are to do it, and if it has to be done, let us do it systematically . . . taking care that the machinery to be provided shall effect the purpose of giving representation, not to accidentally constituted bodies, not to small sections of the people here and there, but to the living strength and vital forces of the whole community of India.

How little have these anticipations been realised ! We have here a striking instance of the extent to which administration can defeat the intentions of legislation.

SEPARATION OF EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS

It is indeed almost more necessary for the contentment of a people that they should have the administration than the enactment of laws. It is moreover desirable that

judicial should, as far as possible, be separated from executive functions, that civil and military employments in medical and other departments should not be held by the same persons. The average military officer, supreme in his own sphere, is of all others, least suited by his training to administer civil affairs in a sympathetic and conciliatory spirit. It has been well said that,

the frame of mind necessary for an executive officer and the frame of mind necessary for a judge are different. Executive officers ought to mix freely with the people, they ought to try to make friends with them, they ought to see this, and they ought to see that; a judge, on the contrary, ought to shut his ears against everything except that which comes before him in court. But an executive officer has as such to learn everything and to do everything, and when he comes upon the bench, he is expected to divest his mind of whatever he has heard elsewhere. Even the best officer of Government is after all a human being.

TRIAL BY JURY

You have properly protested against the curtailment of your rights regarding Trial by Jury. Whether we compare the number of convictions before and since the institution of the system thirty years ago, or the state of affairs in districts where it was not established with that where it was established, there appears nothing to justify recent changes. Officials sometimes forget that the general attitude of the people towards the law is of more consequence than the number of malefactors sentenced. It is an old principle of English jurisprudence that it is better that many guilty should escape than that one innocent man should suffer. Love of law, the conception that it is for the good of all—so deeply implanted in the hearts of sovereign peoples, who have been able to mould it to their will—is naturally a plant of slow growth with peoples less favoured.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE IN INDIA

Regarding criminal procedure in India, the public conscience at home has been from time to time outraged by instances that have reached us of what appeared to be undue partiality towards Europeans. A number of such cases have been summed up in a book by Ram Gopal Sanyal recently published in Calcutta. The Dum Dum

and the Guntakul cases appeared to many of us in Parliament, disastrous miscarriages of justice detrimental to British prestige, the outcome of that brutal contempt for your people which is unhappily still characteristic of many ignorant and prejudiced Europeans, of that race hatred which ought to be the Government's first care to stamp out. The very appearance or suspicion of judging the efficiency of magistrates and police by their success in securing convictions ought surely to be avoided. We all hope that the Government of India, whose desire for impartiality and justice we all admit, is keenly alive to these evils and will try its best to consider favourably your representations on the subject. I trust that ere long they may be removed.

TRUST IN GOD

Meanwhile let us not embitter our lives, or weaken our energies for practical work. Human justice is after all fallible justice. We all fall short where our own interests are concerned. Let what we believe to be injustice by others impel us to higher standards, to nobler ideals of life, to wider charity and forgiveness, to deeper trust in an Omniscience that will yet right every wrong and wipe the tear from every eye.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS IN ENGLAND AND INDIA

We rejoiced on the adoption of Mr. Paul's motion regarding simultaneous examinations; still more at the frank spirit in which it appeared to have been accepted by the Government. We thought it a great step forward—a solid advantage gained. We have been correspondingly disappointed by the extent to which official counsels have since prevailed to the reversal by a Liberal Cabinet of the solemn decision then arrived at. Such vacillation tends to weaken the power of the House of Commons. We have lately seen it used as a reason why the Upper Chamber should properly set at naught the resolutions of the Lower. When public opinion has secured the acceptance by the House of such a great principle, it has a right to consider its work accomplished. I but voice the pain which this

proceeding has caused to many of the most ardent supporters of the Government.

On the other hand, few actions of the present Government are more indicative of the progress of liberal ideas than the recent convention with Japan for the abolition of Consular jurisdiction. This convention may not be without hopeful significance regarding your future. How comes it that powers considered inexpedient to accord to Indian Judges trained in British law have freely and almost without comment been granted to their brethren in Japan?

EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLES

The education of the peoples claims the first attention of Government now-a-days. I regret that in your case the expenditure thereupon bears such a small proportion to that for military purposes. We must, however, individually bear in mind—at least with us in the United Kingdom there is need to bear in mind—that education in itself confers no special claim to employment by the State. Education fits us for life and enables us the better to use and to enjoy life. It widens our horizon. But we must not expect too much from it. It should be a blessing to all; it might easily be a curse to some—if it spoiled them for the proper discharge of the simple duties that come nearest to them.

THE DRINK TRAFFIC

I desire now to refer to three subjects—Drink, the Regulation of Vice, and Opium—which have more particularly interested many British friends of India. In this connection I must confess that, as a member of a professedly Christian land, I am almost ashamed to stand before you. Christians claim to carry a message of love and enlightenment to the world. You and we have come together; and what have been the consequences? Have you wronged us, or have we wronged you? Have you for individual gain forced ruin and demoralisation upon us, or have we forced them upon you? These questions carry

their own answers. We owe our highest civilization and culture originally to the East. In return we have handed back some benefits, but also some of the lowest products of Western civilization.

As to the drink curse (largely introduced and widely extended by us), there has been repeated denunciations in your debates. It has formed the subject of a resolution at more than one Congress. The spread in India of this evil is fully discussed in the debate on the "Reform in Excise Administration" at your sixth and eighth Congress. It is deplorable to hear that "people have become more addicted to drink, because it has been thought to be an adjunct of Western civilization"; that "it has been left for [your] Christian rulers to love it, stimulate it, and pet it, and make money by millions of pounds out of it". In this Presidency the excise license appears to have increased five-fold within forty years. I understand that in India as a whole it has doubled within twenty years. The East India Company, ostensibly at least, strove to reduce consumption. Can we believe that such is the object of Government at the present day? There is scarcely a family in the United Kingdom that has not suffered from the ravages of drink. I am one of those who believe that the safety only lies in complete abstinence. To many peoples our introduction of it has meant annihilation. You cannot be too much upon your guard against its insidious advances. I rejoice that the attention you have given to the subject has already contributed in the Madras Government alone to the closure of thousands of liquor shops. In such respects as these I have long been of the opinion that the crimes committed by society through Government against the people are often greater and less excusable and more disgraceful to character than the worst crimes ever committed by the people against society and against Government. The former are deliberate and far reaching. In a certain sense they are without justification, and every citizen is responsible. The latter have generally been committed by the irresponsible few in moments of excitement.

THE REGULATION OF VICE

With regard to the odious Cantonment Acts, your testimony has been clear and true. At Allahabad in 1888, you unanimously resolved,

that this Congress, having watched with interest and sympathy the exertions that are being made in England for the total abrogation of laws and rules relating to the regulation of prostitution by the State in India, places on record its appreciation of the services thus rendered to this country, and its desire to co-operate by all means in its power in the attainment of this laudable object.

This must have had considerable influence with the Home Government in the changes which it has prescribed and which the Government in India is now so tardily carrying out. The history of this question is most significant from the 9th July 1887, when Lord Cross telegraphed to the Viceroy: "I apprehend the system is indefensible and must be condemned," till 11th August 1893, when Lord Roberts had the manliness to apologize to Mrs. Andrew and Dr. Kate Bushnell for having denied the accuracy of their revelations upon the subject. But for the ability and devotion of these American ladies, officials would still conceal the truth from the British public, as they managed to conceal it even from the responsible head of the responsible department. What a commentary upon Indian administration! What an argument for local representation! That system of administration is indeed faulty which admits of simply docketing, without obeying, instructions that do not meet the approval of officials. It is easy, but cannot be permanent. For the first time—I say it without meaning offence—the methods of the Indian administration have been fully exposed; and since they have been detected in one particular, we at home must beware of too blindly trusting them in others.

OPIUM TRAFFIC

To opium I find little reference in your proceedings. It is a subject which engages the attention of many of the more thoughtful and conscientious of your friends. There are difficulties surrounding it. No doubt, we in the United

Kingdom for our own purposes encouraged the use of the drug, spread its cultivation, and forced it upon China. How are we to retrace our steps? Certainly not at your expense. The decrease of the revenue from this source by 16 per cent. within the past ten years is a warning that it cannot permanently be depended upon. Consideration for the rights of your Independent States complicates the problem. I cannot here initiate discussion upon it. Your business for this Session is already planned and cannot be altered. However, at some time, to us in the United Kingdom, who desire to do our duty in this matter, your knowledge and advice would be helpful.

INDIAN POLICY REACTS ON BRITISH POLICY

The reforms we desire are not likely to be accomplished, your cause cannot be effectually pleaded, until you are satisfactorily represented alike in your Provincial Councils and in the Imperial Parliament. In proportion as each class and each interest within the United Kingdom has come to have its voice heard in the Imperial Parliament, in just such proportion has that assembly been strengthened and dignified. That strength and that dignity will undoubtedly at some period be increased by representation from the component parts of the empire. If the empire is, as we believe it to be, one and indivisible, one indivisible spirit of liberty must pervade every portion of it. If all cannot eventually be raised to one level, all may equally be lowered. If absolutism is necessary here, absolutism will certainly taint and ultimately undermine the fabric of English liberty. Already the workings of ascendancy in India have not been without their influence in retarding steady liberal progress in the United Kingdom.

CONGRESS ACHIEVEMENTS

I have thus ventured, within the short time at my disposal, carefully to lay before you my views regarding the questions that have most engaged your attention and are likely again to come up for discussion. You may the better appreciate the spirit in which I landed upon your shores and in which I shall follow your debates.

We may proceed to our task with hope and confidence. Within the lifetime of a generation, you have obtained what may be regarded as the first instalment of reform in the direction of the expansion and reconstruction of the Legislative Councils, which has cost other countries centuries of toil and effort. You have every reason to be proud of what you have achieved in other directions. You must not be cooled by temporary discouragements, by the unfaithfulness of some, the want of faith of the many. Reform progresses like the steady rise of the tide through many an ebb and flow of the waves. Confident are we that through all storm and cloud the sun of constitutional liberty will yet shine with pure and beneficent effulgence upon your country. Let it be your individual care to carry back from these Congresses into every-day life and every-day occupations true elevation of mind, belief in your future and your own power to mould your future. This future depends more upon yourselves than upon any political or financial changes. Before all, you must cultivate a spirit of generous toleration and of charity between class and class, and creed and creed.

Considering the general advancement of the world, from which no portion of its surface can be permanently excluded, we have every cause of encouragement, every incentive to press forward, setting no limits to the possible material and spiritual advancement of mankind. Never before were men and women so alive to their capacities and to their responsibilities towards each other. Let us advance together in ever-widening combinations, with ever-broadening hopes, labouring for the good of all.

For oh ! it were a gallant deed
To show before mankind,
How every race and every creed
Might be by love combined—
Might be combined, yet not forget
The fountains whence they rose
As, filled by many a rivulet,
This stately Ganges flows.

One of your sages has compared the soul of man to a bird, and earthly existence to the period marked by its

flight through a room—out of the illimitable into the limitable. By devoting ourselves to the good of others we can best occupy that brief space. The wise assertion of common rights is enlightened altruism.

CONCLUSION

Here I bring to a conclusion, as, with the exception of a few sentences, I had prepared it in Ireland on the occasion. Since then, I have landed in India, have seen some of your schools and colleges, have lingered in the crowded streets of your cities, have listened to the hum of your manufactures, have talked with your leaders, have watched the sunrise and sunset on the plains where such a large proportion of your population hardly wring their living from the soil. I now somewhat realise the surpassing beauty of your land. I have met you here face to face. How faint and weak, how inadequate the expression of my inmost feelings is what I have written and read. Apart from those family and national ties which to each one of us are the first of life's blessings, the choicest gifts of God, I regard this visit to India, this permission to take part in the proceedings of this august assemblage as the highest privilege that has ever fallen to my lot, one that cannot but profoundly influence my remaining years. Two convictions before all others press themselves in upon me: The one, the greatness of the mission of the United Kingdom in this land, apart from its inception and much of its history. The other, that this Congress movement is the necessary and logical outcome, the richest fruit of that noble mission of which we English, Scotch, and Irish people should be proud. You yourselves are taking up the work, the work which you and you alone can ultimately perfect—"the eradication, by direct friendly intercourse, of all possible race, creed or national prejudices amongst all lovers of your country." This is, in truth, the greatest combined peaceful effort for the good of the largest number of the human race that History has recorded.

Eleventh Congress—Poona—1895

HON. SURENDRANATH BANERJEA

PRESIDENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

BROTHER DELEGATES, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I thank you heartily for electing me as President of this Congress. I can conceive of no higher honour—no loftier trust—no more exalted dignity—than that to which you have summoned me by your united suffrages. The highest reward which in these days a public man may receive, next to the approbation of his own conscience, is the confidence of his fellow-countrymen. For him what higher mark of honour or what nobler incentive to duty could there be than his election as the President of an assembly like this which is the non-official Parliament of his nation? But great as the honour is, far higher is the responsibility which belongs to it. It is a part of the divine arrangement that where there is a privilege there is also corresponding duty. Your President is not only your speaker; he is something more. It is his duty to maintain order, to regulate your proceedings and to facilitate the despatch of your business. Having regard to the magnitude of this assembly, this in itself would make a heavy demand upon the resources, physical and mental, of the strongest and the ablest among us. But your President has other duties imposed upon him. During the three days that the Congress is in session he is your spokesman, your organ, the right arm of your strength. He voices forth the spirit which animates you in your deliberations, the temper which guides you in the solemn and arduous task which lies before you. One may well stagger at a responsibility so vast and so many-sided; but

your forbearance and generosity is the saving element in the situation. The moment you induct any one into the chair—the moment you install him in his office—from that moment you accord him in an unstinted measure your sympathy and your support. You forgive him his faults—you overlook his mistakes—you help him in his task—and you send him forth to his work, with your prayers and your benedictions. It has been truly remarked that the manner in which people conduct themselves at a public meeting is some evidence of their capacity for Self-Government. Judged by this test you are past-masters in the art. (*Cheers.*) For I know of no assembly more orderly in its conduct, more deferential to constituted authority, more firm in its adherence to its programme and yet withal more moderate in the expression thereof than these yearly gatherings of the National Congress. (*Hear, hear.*) Nay more, weak as your President may be, he and the Congress are supported by an unseen force of immense potency. The good wishes of the educated community follow us. They are present in spirit, if not present in body. They are watching our deliberations with intense interest. They pour forth their heart's prayer for the success of our work. (*Loud cheers.*)

CONGRESS MOVEMENT

I was not a little amused and interested to read in an English newspaper the other day a statement to the effect that the women of my province had idolized the Congress, and that it had duly found its place in the Hindu pantheon. The fact is laid hold of by the writer as evidence of the superstition and ignorance of the people and their incapacity for representative institutions. I was not aware that any responsible Congressman had ever asked for representative institutions for our women or for the masses of our people. However much we may love and respect our ladies, we do not think they are yet qualified for representative government. They are not even supposed to be qualified in England. Our demand is much more limited. We should be satisfied if we obtain representative institutions of a modified character for the

educated community who, by reason of their culture and enlightenment, their assimilation of English ideas and their familiarity with English methods of Government, might be presumed to be qualified for such a boon. But it would be useless to traverse the statement or the inference which is sought to be deduced from it. It would be almost cruel to dissipate the little romance which has gathered round our great movement. But this I will say on your behalf, that God or no God, whether the Congress has found a place in the Hindu pantheon or not, it is enshrined in the hearts of the educated community of India—it excites their deepest reverence, stirs their most earnest enthusiasm—it is the God of their idolatry—it is indissolubly bound up with and forms part and parcel of the life of New India. (*Loud and prolonged cheers.*)

CONGRESS SESSION AT POONA

In addressing you on this occasion it is impossible not to advert for a moment to the circumstance of the Congress being held at Poona. This is the first time the Congress assembles in this great historical city. It was purely an accident that deprived Poona of the honour of being the birthplace of the Congress. The first Congress was to have been held here, but sickness broke out in the city, and the *venue* had to be changed to Bombay. But though deprived of this honour by an untoward accident, your citizens and the people of the Deccan at large have had a great hand in the up-building of the Congress. Nearly two centuries ago your ancestors built up an empire which contended with Britain for supremacy in India. But those days of strife are past and gone. If war has its victories, peace also has her triumphs; and this Congress will remain to you and to those who have worked with you as a monument of your energy and of your devotion to the country in these times, when the triumphs of peace are the most enduring.

LOCAL CONTROVERSIES—A CRISIS AVERTED

It would be mere affectation on my part were I to ignore these events which preceded the session of the

Congress at Poona, and which for a time, at least, filled the public mind of India with alarm and anxiety. I am a stranger to your local politics and your local feeling. I have no right to judge. I have not the means to judge. Who am I that I should judge? But spectators sometimes see more of the game than the actual players. And this I will venture to say that those who were in favour of the Social Conference being held in the *Pandal* and those who were opposed to it were all animated by one common sentiment of devotion to the Congress movement. They differed in their methods. We who stand outside your local controversies, while we sympathise with the deep-seated convictions of all parties and admire the noble sacrifice which the Secretary of the Conference has made to restore amity and concord, must ask you to exercise mutual charity and forbearance to forget and to forgive, and to unite in one common effort to make this Congress worthy of the capital of *Maharashtra*, and an example to all future Congresses. In this connection I cannot help expressing my sense of admiration at the conciliatory attitude so strikingly displayed by Mr. Justice Ranade, Secretary of the Social Conference, at a critical stage in the history of the controversy to which I have referred. It averted a crisis which might have proved disastrous to the best interests of the Congress. The Congress owes a heavy debt of gratitude to Mr. Justice Ranade.

COSMOPOLITAN CHARACTER OF THE CONGRESS

We cannot afford to have a schism in our camp. Already they tell us that it is a Hindu Congress, although the presence of our Mahomedan friends completely contradicts the statement. Let it not be said that this is the Congress of one social party rather than that of another. It is the Congress of United India, of Hindus and Mahomedans, of Christians, of Parsis, and of Sikhs, of those who would reform their social customs and those who would not. Here we stand upon a common platform—here we have all agreed to bury our social and religious differences and recognise

the one common fact that being subjects of the same Sovereign and living under the same Government and the same political institutions, we have common rights and common grievances. And we have called forth this Congress into existence with a view to safeguard and extend our rights and redress our grievances. What should we say of a Faculty of Doctors who fell out, because though in perfect accord as to the principles of their science, they could not agree as to the age at which they should marry their daughters, or whether they should remarry their widowed daughters or not.

CONGRESS AND SOCIAL REFORM

The Congress has now been in existence for eleven years. We have not as yet got a written constitution, though I hope, we shall provide ourselves with one before we separate. But there has grown around us a body of usages, the unwritten customary law of the Congress, which govern our movement. If there is one principle more than another, which is uniformly accepted, and universally assented to, it is this—that, no matter what differences of opinion may exist among us as regards religious beliefs or social usages, they shall be no bar to our acting together in Congress—they shall not be permitted to interrupt the cordiality of our relations as Congressmen. Never was the truth of this remark more strikingly illustrated than in connection with the agitation on the Consent Bill. Congressmen and Congress leaders arrayed themselves on opposite sides. Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, whose ill-health we all deplore, and who if he were better would probably have occupied the chair which I so unworthily fill, strenuously opposed the Bill; our great leader, Mr. Allan Hume, was as strenuously in favour of it. Our political opponents fanned the flames. They looked forward to an approaching schism. They were disappointed. We rapidly closed our ranks. This controversy took place in the early part of 1891; the Congress of 1891 held at Nagpur was as successful as any

of the previous Congresses had been. Ours is a political and not a social movement; and it cannot be made a matter of complaint against us that we are not a social organization any more than it can be urged against any of my lawyer friends that they are not doctors. Even in regard to political matters, such is our respect for the opinions of minorities, so far back as 1887, I think it was at the instance of Mr. Budruddin Tyabji, who once was our President and whose elevation to the Bench of the Bombay High Court is a matter of national congratulation, a resolution was passed to the effect that where there is practical unanimity among a class, though in a minority in the Congress, that a question should not be discussed, it should forthwith be abandoned. We who show such great respect for the opinions of others deserve at least an equal measure of consideration from all, be they friends or be they otherwise.

DISSENSION IN THE CONGRESS CAMP

There is special danger to which an organisation, such as ours, is exposed and which must be guarded against. In the days of its infancy, when it is persecuted and reviled, the members stand fast together, their cohesion is great, and the compactness of the organization is in proportion to the pressure of adverse circumstances brought to bear upon it. But when these days are past and gone, when the sun of prosperity begins to shine upon it, when the prestige of victory come to be associated with its honored name, when opposition has dwindled down to the proportions of an occasional and feeble protest, uttered by some journalist who is not abreast of the times and who has not perhaps forgotten his old love for the movement, then we are confronted with the danger of there being developed from within the seeds of dissension and dispute. Relieved from the pressure of adverse circumstances, the cohesion of the members is apt to grow less, their enthusiasm to cool and the consistency of the organisation to give way to the demoralizing influence of success.

I am sure we have not yet arrived at the stage. We are still exposed to the taunts and jeers of our opponents—we are still regarded as a set of impracticable people whose knowledge of all things, specially of finance, leaves much room for improvement. Our progress though satisfactory, considering our opportunities and the short time we have been in existence as an organisation, is insignificant when compared with what we have yet to achieve before we reach the goal of our aspirations, the promised land of equal freedom and of equal rights with British subjects, which has ever been the dream of Congress leaders, and which, when realized, will constitute, in the words of the late Sir Madhava Row, “the soundest triumph of British administration and a crown of glory to British rule”. Having regard to our achievements in the past, the possibilities which unfold themselves in the future, and the trust we have assumed to safeguard and extend the sphere of our rights, we should be false to ourselves if we did not stand shoulder to shoulder, forgetful of all differences, in the one common endeavour to uphold the national interests as represented by the Congress.

CONGRESS CONSTITUTION

This leads me to the question of the constitution of the Congress. Having regard to recent events, we must accord to it the forefront place—the place of honour—in our debates. I have referred to the usages, the unwritten law, of the Congress. It must be admitted that the time has come when we must clearly define these usages, and accord to them the deliberate and authoritative sanction of the Congress. The need of a constitution was felt very early in the history of our movement. We are fighting a constitutional battle, and it was felt that we should place our organisation upon a constitutional basis. So far back as the year 1887 at the Third Session of the Congress held at Madras, the very first resolution that was passed was a resolution appointing a Committee to draft a set of rules to be laid before the Congress on the

last day of its sitting. I will read to you the Resolution :

That a Committee be appointed consisting of the gentlemen marginally enumerated to consider what rules, if any, may now be usefully framed in regard to the institution and working of the Congress with instructions to report thereon on the 30th instant.

In accordance with this Resolution, the Committee reported on the 30th December, and a Resolution was passed to the effect that the rules be circulated to the Standing Congress Committees who were to work on them so far as practicable, and to report thereon to the next Congress. Let me reproduce the text of the Resolution :

That the rules drafted by the Committee appointed under Resolution—stand over for consideration till next Congress, but that in the meantime copies be circulated to all Standing Congress Committees with the request that they will during the coming year act in accordance with these rules so far as they seem to them possible and desirable, and report thereon to the next Congress with such further suggestions as to them may seem meet.

I regret to have to say that the matter was not reported to the next Congress which met at Allahabad and was not considered by them. It was not considered till 1894 at the Madras Congress of last year. In 1893, when the Congress met at Lahore, a strongly-felt wish was expressed in favour of providing the Congress with a constitution without further loss of time. It was, I think, those good and self-sacrificing men connected with the Anglo-Vedic College who urged upon us the need of a constitution. They pointed to their own great College as evidence of what might be done by organised effort proceeding upon a constitutional basis. Nothing, however, was done in 1893. It was too late to discuss the question. In 1894, at the last Session of the Congress held in Madras, the matter was again considered when the following Resolution was passed :

That this Congress is of opinion that the time has come when the constitution of the Congress should be settled and rules and regulations laid down as to the number of delegates, their qualifications, the localities for assemblage and the like, and with this view the Congress requests the Standing Committee of Poona to draw up draft rules and circulate them among the different Standing Congress Committees for their report; these reports.

together with the draft rules and the report thereon to be laid before the next Congress for consideration.

The Poona Committee have, I understand, at the last moment drawn up a body of rules which they have circulated to the Congress Committee. The Standing Congress Committee have not considered these rules and the reports are not before us. I have not the smallest desire to excuse the Standing Congress Committees elsewhere at the expense of the Poona Committee. They might easily have moved in the matter and appealed to the Poona Committee; but they took no action—they slept over the matter. I think we must all share the responsibility of this tardy action on the part of the Poona Committee. We are never tired of reminding the Government of their broken promises. The one charge which we urge against the Government—which we repeat *ad nauseam*—which we reiterate in season and out of season, is that they have made large promises which they have only inadequately redeemed, and that the measure of their performances falls short of the measure of their promises. Are we not in all conscience amenable to the same charge? We have more than once solemnly undertaken to provide the Congress with a constitution. More than once have we broken this promise. Our declarations are a dead letter. We have not carried them out. But it is no use lamenting over the past. Let the dead past bury their dead. Let us retrieve the mistakes and omissions of the past. Let us, before we separate, have a few well-defined rules which will embody existing practice and obviate future difficulties. We may follow the precedent set by the Madras Congress of 1887; appoint a Committee to frame rules on the first day with instructions to report on or before the last day of the Congress. We need not circulate these rules to the Standing Congress Committees. That is the old plea for inaction. We shall not have any rules at all if we are to repeat the hapless experiments of former years. Nor need our rules be like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, rigid and inflexible, admitting of no change, no modification. If we find any rule working badly, there is

nothing to prevent our changing it. I earnestly appeal to you, brother-delegates, as a fellow-worker and an old Congressman, to apply yourselves to this task. It will be evidence of your practical wisdom, of your ready recognition of public opinion, and of your capacity to adapt yourselves to the environments of your situation. A Congress with a constitution would be far more potent for good than a Congress without a constitution. A representative body like the Congress, organized upon a constitutional basis, cannot long exist by the side of a bureaucratic Government without powerfully influencing it for good. A Congress with a constitution would be the living protest of the educated community against a form of administration, where the will of the few and not the voice of the many prevails.

CONGRESS : ITS GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

From the consideration of the constitution of the Congress, we pass on to discuss the constitution of the Government of this country; and as in our own case, so also here, much remains to be done. At this stage, and standing upon the vantage-ground we happen to occupy, we may pause for a moment to take a brief retrospect of the past, if only to derive from it the inspiration and guidance for the future. The illustrious men—I feel the less hesitation in bearing my humble testimony to their worth, as I was not one of them—who founded the Congress at Bombay—some of whom are dead and gone, whose memories we revere, and the memory of none do we cherish with a greater measure of reverence than that of the young, the versatile, the brilliant Kashinath Trimbak Telang—these illustrious men did not in their wildest dreams anticipate the great future which awaited their movement. In this connection I am reminded of the exquisite lines of Longfellow which occur in his “Spanish Student” describing the spirit which pervades the achievements of the man of genius. The man of genius, says he, finds around him

All the means of action ;
The shapeless masses,—the materials.

They lie everywhere around him. Footsore and weary with travel he comes, and with the uncouth charcoal he inscribes on the wall. And lo and behold ! transfigured by the magic of his touch,

All its hidden virtues shine.

It gleams a diamond.

The forces were there; the materials were there; they lay in shapeless masses. The hour had come; the men were there. They communicated to them the Promethean spark, the celestial fire which made them instinct with life, and under their controlling guidance, the Congress has developed into a movement fraught with unspeakable blessings to generations of my countrymen yet unborn. The birth of the Congress had, indeed, been foreseen by the great men who had been associated with the Anglo-Indian Government in the early stages of its progressive development. Macaulay, speaking from his place in Parliament on the occasion of the enactment of the Charter Act, used language which had about it the ring of prophetic inspiration :

"It may be," said he, "that the public mind of India may so expand under our system as to outgrow that system ; that our subjects, being brought up under good Government, may develop a capacity for better Government, that being instructed in European knowledge they may crave for European institutions. I know not whether such a day will ever come, but when it does come, it will be the proudest day in the annals of England."

We have met to celebrate this day, the proudest in the annals of England and India. The National Congress is the outcome of those civilizing influences which Macaulay and his co-adjutors were instrumental in implanting in the Government of this country. It has a brilliant record. I will claim this for the Congress that it has not taken up a single question which it has not brought within the range of practical politics, or which it has not brought nearer to solution. You took up the question of the separation of judicial and executive functions. It has been declared to be a counsel of perfection by so high an authority as

Lord Dufferin. You took up the Excise question. In my Province, in the more crowded districts, the outstills have been abolished. You agitated for the reform of the police. In my Province, a Police Commission was appointed, and, though the police remains very much what it was, I must say that a genuine effort is being made by the Government to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission. You insisted in season and out of season upon the wider employment of our countrymen in the higher offices of State. The Public Service Commission was appointed; and, though I cannot congratulate the Government upon the manner in which it has dealt with the recommendations of the Commission as the outcome of their deliberations, the maximum limit of age for the Open Competitive Examination was raised. Last but not least is the crowning triumph of the Congress in the recognition by the Government of the representative element in the reconstitution of the enlarged Councils.

But the subjective triumph of the Congress—its moral victories—are even more remarkable than its outward achievements. You have introduced a new spirit into the country. You have infused a new enthusiasm into your countrymen. You have brought together the scattered elements of a vast and diversified population—you have welded them into a compact and homogeneous mass—you have made them vibrate with the new-born sentiment of an awakened nationality—you have unified them for the common purposes of their political enfranchisement. Along with the new-born impulse which you have thus communicated, and which draws its inspiration from the living examples of English greatness, you have placed before your countrymen lofty ideals of public duty, which are slowly transforming the national character, imparting to the flexibility of the East, the stamina and the stability of the West. Above all, you have taught your countrymen to glory in the British connection and to seek to perpetuate it not by submitting to invidious and irritating distinctions, but by claiming to participate in full in the rights of British citizenship.

REFORM OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

Hitherto we had placed the reform of the Legislative Councils in the forefront among our topics of discussion. Then came the Councils Act of 1892 which reconstituted the Councils and enlarged their functions. What is our attitude with regard to this Act? Are we satisfied with it and with the manner in which it is being worked? I am afraid we must answer the question in the negative. We regard the measure in the light of a cautious experiment which is being tried by the Government. Caution is an element of statesmanship. But caution carried to an excess—caution which is but another name for timidity—is a mistake and may even amount to a blunder. We have no objection to the Government exercising due caution before it takes “a big jump into the unknown”. Weighted with the sense of its great responsibility, the Government must look around before it makes an important departure from the lines of its ancient policy. But what we complain of is, that the experiment might have been tried under conditions most favourable to its success, more consonant to the declarations which were made in Parliament by statesmen on both sides of the House at the time of the enactment of the measure. Mr. Gladstone looked forward to a living representation of the Indian people. Lord Salisbury was anxious that the machinery provided should give representation not to small sections of the people but to the living strength and the vital forces of the whole community. Have these anticipations been realized by the light of accomplished facts? In Bengal, seven elected members represent the living strength and the vital forces of a whole community of 70 millions of people. The Councils have been enlarged, but in no sense so as to provide even a tolerably moderate representation of the people. In the United Kingdom, a population of 40 millions is represented by 670 members. In Bengal, a population of 70 millions is represented by only seven elected members, or if you like, by 10 members if you take the nominated non-official members to represent the people, or by 20 members if you take the whole Council to represent the Province. The result is, that the election taking place under a

system of rotation, whole divisions are left unrepresented in the Council. Out of the 6 Divisions in Bengal at the present moment, the Presidency Division which is the most important, and the Chota Nagpur and Orissa Divisions are left out in the representation. I am aware that this is a faulty arrangement which might be rectified by lumping up the Divisions, as is done elsewhere, so as to enable the whole Province to take part in the elections. But is it possible under any conceivable arrangement, by any form of administrative manipulation, to secure in the words of Mr. Gladstone, the living representation of the Indian people, or, in the words of Lord Salisbury, the representation of the whole community, and not of small sections of the people, without materially adding to the strength of the elective element in the Councils? But we are confronted with a difficulty on the very threshold. Under Section 1 of the Indian Councils Act of 1892, the maximum number of additional members for the Governor-General's Council is fixed at 16, and the maximum number of additional members for the Legislative Councils of Madras and Bombay is fixed at 20; and as regards Bengal and the North-Western Provinces, the position seems to be still more unsatisfactory. The number of members for the Bengal Council is not to exceed 20, and that for the North-Western Provinces is not to exceed 15. Why in the Calcutta Municipality we have 75 members to represent a population of 700,000 inhabitants, and a much lesser number of rate-payers; in the District Boards in Bengal, the number varies from 10 to 40. In some of our more important Mofussil Municipalities, the number is more than 20; in most Municipalities having an average income varying from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 20,000 a year, the number is fixed at 18. But here, in the representation of great Provinces, in their Legislative Councils, the number is never to exceed 25, and is often less. I am well aware of the difficulties of the Government. They must have a standing majority in the Councils. They will say:

It is all very well for you to raise these objections. Your counsel is a counsel of perfection, we admit. But there are

practical difficulties in the way, which we, as practical administrators, must take note of. We must have a standing majority in the Councils. If we add to the elective element, we must add to the number of nominated members. The requisite number of officials may not be available at the Presidency Towns, or if available, their appointment to the Councils may lead to serious administrative inconvenience and may involve additional expense—a matter which is not to be overlooked in these days of poverty and impecuniosity.

We fully admit the force of these objections. But the difficulties are really not insuperable. They admit of easy solution. The Government need not appoint official members to the Council to secure a majority. There are plenty of people who, though non-officials, would in this respect serve them better than officials. The experience of public bodies, where officials and non-officials meet for the transaction of public business, entirely confirms this view of the matter. In the Calcutta Municipality, the proportion of elected members is two-thirds of the entire body. The Government is in a hopeless minority. The Chairman is an official and is appointed by the Government. He is the organ of the Government. Though in a minority, I have never known a Chairman fail to carry through any Resolution upon which he has set his heart. Whenever he wants it, he has a majority. The experience of the District Boards in Bengal entirely bears out the same view. One-half of the members are elected, the other half are nominated. The nominated members are not necessarily officials. The Chairman is the Magistrate of the District. He holds the balance of power. He is the dictator of the situation. He rules the District Boards. In the Councils, the position of the Government will be still more favourable. The President will be the head of the Local Government, his prestige will be great, his personality will carry immense influence; and if the number of members be materially increased as we suggest, though only one-half of them should be nominated and among the nominated members there should be non-officials, the Government will still have a standing majority.

THE INDIAN COUNCILS ACT

I say once again that if the Indian Councils Act is to be given effect to, in the spirit in which it was conceived by the distinguished statesmen who took part in its enactment, if it is to give to the people of India a living representation of the whole community and not of small sections of the people, the number of elected members must be sensibly increased; at any rate discretion should be given to the Government of India to increase the number, subject to such rules as the Government may think fit to make in that behalf. This can be easily done by a small modification of Section 1 of the Statute of 1892. Such a measure would strengthen the popular element in the Councils; but the Government would also share in the benefits which it would confer. A larger number of elected representatives in the Councils would place the Government in touch with the real opinion of the country. The voice that would be heard in the Councils would not be the voice of this party, or of that party, of this clique or of that, but the living voice of the Indian people.

I am well aware of the objections that will be urged against my proposal. It will be said: "You got the Councils Act amended only the other day. It is too early to think of amending it again." To that I have an obvious reply to give. It is never too early to raise the cry for reform. We must cry betimes, cry late, cry incessantly, fill the air with our importunate clamour, and then only can we hope to move the Government to take any action. *Quieta non movere*, in the words of Sir Robert Walpole, is the accepted creed of all Governments. They never move except under the irresistible pressure of a public opinion which will admit no delay or postponement. You have your own experience to guide you in the matter. You began the agitation for the reform of the Councils in 1885. In Bengal, we began it earlier, and the concession was made to us, though not in complete accordance with our anticipations or our wishes, only so recently as 1892. In making the present demand we are encouraged

by the unquestionable success which has so far attended the experiment which is being tried. Sir Charles Elliott, speaking from his place as President of the Bengal Legislative Council, thus bore testimony to the distinct accession of strength to the Council which the addition of the elective element has secured :

I am quite satisfied in my own mind that the extension of the Council has materially added to its strength, and to its popularity and to its power of doing good for the country. Of the Hon'ble Members present, there are, I think, three whose term of office will come to an end before we meet next time and who may be re-elected or who may not. If they are re-elected, we shall welcome them back ; if not, we hope we shall find in their successors, colleagues who are as generous and as zealous as they have been.

INTERPELLATION IN LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

The Councils have been reconstituted, and their functions have been enlarged. The most important addition to the functions of the Councils consists in conferring upon members the right of interpellation. We are truly grateful to the Government for this right. It is an inestimable boon. No Government which did not feel strong in the strength of conscious rectitude would venture to confer such a boon upon a foreign dependency. In the dark days of the Second Empire in France, when repression was the order of the day, the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies were deprived of this right.

It was the feeling of conscious rectitude that in the main led the Executive Council of the Government of India to recommend that this right should be conferred upon Members of Council. Sir Charles Elliott has let us into the secrets of his "prison house". He told us the other day from his place as President of the Bengal Legislative Council, that Sir George Chesney argued in the Executive Council that the Government had nothing to conceal. Lord Dufferin urged that it would often help the Government to dispel false reports and to clear up misconceptions which were embarrassing to the administration. Lord Dufferin never showed greater prescience. I will here only refer to two questions that were asked in the course of this year. A few months back it was

reported in one of the Anglo-Indian papers of Calcutta—the *Indian Daily News*, I think it was—that the Government had it in contemplation to frame a new set of rules in connection with the Official Secrets Act with a view to render these rules more stringent in their operation. The report created a considerable stir. Articles appeared in the newspapers; the motives of Government were aspersed. A question was put in Council. The Chief Secretary replied that there was no truth in the report, and that the Government did not mean to take any action in regard to these rules. The misconception was removed—the excitement disappeared. Take the other case. Some time ago there appeared a very sensational account of a murder case at Chittagong in one of the newspapers which, if true, implied a grave reflection upon the local officials. A question was put in Council. A very elaborate answer was given, and the conduct of the officials was placed in its proper light.

During the year now closing, ugly rumours were afloat to the effect that the Government intended to restrict the right. There went forth a unanimous protest against the proposed restriction from the Indian Press and from such organs of Anglo-Indian opinion as sympathised with the legitimate aspirations of the people. There was not, indeed, the shadow of a justification for the proposed restriction. Questions must always be more or less vexatious. To say that the questions were vexatious was to object to them, because they were questions. To say that the questions put were too many was to ignore the obvious circumstances of the situation. The Councils did not meet as often as might be expected—the opportunities for asking questions were limited, and they necessarily accumulated in the hands of members.

THE RIGHT OF INTERPELLATION

It is, indeed, the unanimous testimony of officials and non-officials that the right has been exercised in a manner that is creditable to the members and conducive to the public interests. The writer on Indian affairs in the

Times, a discriminating judge in these matters, thus observes :

The practical operation of the system indicates that the Viceregal forecast of its working, from Lord Ripon onwards, was the correct one. The questions asked in the Supreme and Provincial Legislatures during the past two years cover the whole area of Indian administration and of the economic interest of the people. With scarcely an exception, they have tended to a better understanding between the rulers and the ruled ; and in important instances they have furnished a valuable opportunity of placing the actual facts before the public.

With regard to the exercise of the right in the Bengal Council, the same writer thus bears equally satisfactory testimony :

In a forward Province like Bengal, with Calcutta as its capital, and a native Press extremely active if not always accurately informed, the practice of interpellation has proved even more useful. The Bengal Government has to deal with the chronic unrest arising out of the desire of the educated classes to enjoy an ever-increasing share of the higher posts of the Administration. The present Governor of Bengal has recognized the necessity of dealing with such aspirations in a spirit of fairness, and, indeed, of generosity. Sir Charles Elliott has opened up the higher offices of his Government to natives of India to an extent never dreamt of by his predecessors. 'It is only the confidence which Englishmen in India have in the practical sagacity and sound common sense of Sir Charles Elliott as an experienced administrator,' writes the leading Calcutta journal, 'that induces them to refrain from regarding with suspicion the liberal concessions which he has inaugurated, concessions which, as we have said, no other Government up to the present time has ventured to imitate. But a section of the Bengal Press by a curious misapprehension demands that all offices for which the Public Service Commission declared natives to be eligible shall forthwith be filled by a native, irrespective of the fact that there may be many European officers better qualified for the individual post. It is, of course, unsuitable for a Government to enter into newspaper controversies, and a misconception of this character becomes a source of a widespread political disquiet in Bengal. Fortunately a distinguished Hindu member of the Bengal Council put a question which embodied the general misapprehension and enabled the Government to correct it.

From non-official let us pass on to official testimony and the testimony which I am going to quote is that of no less exalted an official than Sir Charles Elliott. The late Lieutenant-Governor was a thorough-going official—some

would prefer to call him a typical bureaucrat. But at any rate he was no mean judge of the matter. This was what he said from his place as President of the Bengal Legislative Council:

I think you will agree with me that the results have not altogether met the anticipations which we formed. Somehow or other—it is difficult to say how—a sort of idea has grown up in the public mind that an interpellation must necessarily be hostile, and that an Hon'ble Member who puts an interpellation may be presumed to have a desire to heckle the Government or to expose its shortcomings in some way or another. I think it is most unfortunate that such a feeling should have grown up. It has been due to criticisms which have been passed on the style of questions put not so much in this Council as in the Councils of other Provinces, and I think in many cases these criticisms, whether applied to other provinces or applied to this Province, have not been altogether reasonable or sympathetic. I certainly feel that I have nothing very much to complain of as regards the spirit with which interpellations have been put here, but I think that we might put interpellations upon a better footing if it were thoroughly understood that the Government desire to deal with all the members of this Council as its trusted Councillors whom it wishes to associate with itself in its policy, and to whom it wishes to impart the information which it possesses.

Having regard to the testimony of the high authorities I have quoted, might we not ask for the removal of those restrictions which seem to me to defeat the purposes of a beneficent legislation. In the House of Commons "sometimes when an answer has been given, further questions are addressed to the Minister on the same subject", apparently with a view to offer an explanation or remove a misconception. In the House of Lords greater latitude is allowed in putting questions (Erskine May, "Parliamentary Practice," page 329). In the House of Lords when a question is put, the member putting it may make a speech in explanation of the question and by way of preface to it. One of the objects which the Government had in view in conferring the right of interpellation was to afford opportunities for clearing up misconceptions with regard to the measures of Government and the conduct of officials. Looking at the matter from this standpoint, it seems to me that the object which the Government had in view would be best served by adopting the practice of

the House of Commons—a practice which has been sanctioned by the wisdom of ages.

DISCUSSION OF THE BUDGET IN LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

Under the Indian Councils Amended Act of 1892, not only have the Councils been partially reconstituted, but their functions have been enlarged—the discussion of the Budget has been allowed, whether it is proposed to levy any new tax or not. This right, however, is to be exercised subject to an important reservation. Members may discuss the Budget—may make any observations they please—but they cannot move any Resolution in respect of any item in the Budget or divide the Council thereupon. This seems to me to be altogether a needless restriction, having regard to the fact that the Government has a standing majority in the Councils. If the non-official members were united to a man, they could not carry any Resolution if the Government was firmly resolved to oppose it. I venture to submit that if there is one class of questions more than another in respect of which the representatives of the people should exercise any control, it is financial questions. No taxation without representation is the theory of modern civilised Government. We do not ask the Government to embody this principle in the administration of the country. We know that politics is a practical art, and it cannot deal with principles in the abstract. Every political principle must be tested by reference to the actual circumstances under which it is sought to apply it; but when, as in this case, the acceptance of our recommendation can lead to no practical inconvenience but on the contrary is calculated still further to extend the immediate objects of the Indian Councils Act of 1892, and to add to the popularity of the administration, we feel that we stand on sure ground, and that we may appeal with confidence to the Government to adopt it. Englishmen are our teachers. At their feet we have learnt those constitutional principles which have moulded the Government of civilized worlds, and which we hope will one day be incorporated in the Government of this country. If there is one thing more

than another which their constitutional history impresses upon the mind of the reader, it is this: the zealous solicitude which the English people show at every stage of their history to ensure to their representatives, and to them alone, the full and absolute control over the finances of the country. A money bill becomes law when it has passed the House of Commons. The House of Lords has no sort of jurisdiction over it. I find that in the Ceylon Legislative Council there is no bar to a member moving any Resolution on a financial question, provided the previous assent of the Governor has been obtained thereto. A beginning might indeed be made upon these lines. If the Government hesitates to grant to our representatives in Council the right of moving Resolutions on the Budget without some reservation, the concession may be made subject to the restriction to which I have referred, and which obtains in the Ceylon Legislative Council.

THE BUDGET DEBATE--A FARCE

The question of the Budget naturally leads me to consider how our laws are made. A private member may indeed introduce a Bill subject to leave being granted by Government. Practically, however, the work of legislation is left in the hands of the Government. It must be so in this as in all other countries. So far as the local Councils are concerned, if it is proposed to introduce a Bill, it is prepared by the Local Government in the Legislative Department. It is then submitted to the Government of India, and the sanction of the Government having been obtained, it is introduced into the Council. In the Governor-General's Council before a Bill is introduced it is submitted for the sanction of the Secretary of State. The result is, that whether a Bill is introduced into a Local Legislative Council with the assent of the Government of India, or into the Supreme Legislative Council with the assent of the Secretary of State, the sanction of superior authority in each case operates in the nature of a mandate upon the somewhat susceptible minds of official members. They vote in a solid phalanx. The amendments of non-official members have absolutely no

chance. There is the mandate, express or implied. The Bill must be passed as assented to by the Government of India or the Secretary of State. Legislation under these circumstances becomes a foregone conclusion—the debate a mere formal ceremony—some people will call it a farce. (*Hear, hear*)

THE OFFICIAL MANDATE THEORY

But the theory of a mandate was never so broadly stated as it was last year by His Excellency the Viceroy and some of his official colleagues on the occasion of the debate on the Excise Bill. Sir Henry Brackenbury, the military member, observed with the bluntness of a soldier that in the matter of voting “they were bound to obey orders given by proper and constituted authority”. His Excellency the Viceroy would not accord to members absolute freedom “to speak and vote in the Council for the measure they think best. The right must be exercised subject to an important qualification—they must recognise the responsibility under which they exercised their rights in the Council. His Excellency went on to observe that even Members of Parliament are not free to act as they please, but are distinctly subject to the mandate of their constituents. This exposition of the theory of a mandate from higher authority, to vote not in accordance with the dictates of one’s own conscience, but rather in obedience to superior authority, elicited a strong protest in Council from Sir Griffith Evans, Mr. Pherozeshah Mehta and others, and I am sure you, too, will record your protest against a principle which, if accepted, would be fatal to the independence of non-official Members of Council. Whether or not Members of Parliament act under any mandate received from their constituents is a matter which we need not discuss here. Members of Parliament are well able to take care of themselves and their consciences. The mandate theory is an old theory—it does not appear before us even in a new garb. After the lapse of a century, it is presented to us in the nakedness of its original simplicity. It formed the subject of an emphatic protest from Edmund Burke, one of the greatest names in

English politics. His colleague in the representation of Bristol had raised the question, and Burke replied in a letter which has found a permanent place in the political literature of England. I will read an extract from his letter to the Electors of Bristol, which might fittingly be laid before those who take a different view of the subject—

Authoritative instructions, mandates issued, which the member is, bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote, and to argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience—these are things utterly unknown to the laws of the land, and which arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our constitution.

Yet Burke was a Conservative. He called himself a Whig—but he was truly a Conservative statesman—he was a Heaven-appointed Conservative—one made so by the hand of Nature. His sympathies and leanings were all distinctly towards the Conservative side of questions. In these days he would have taken his place in the front-rank of Conservative leaders, only his Conservatism was not prompted by self-interest; it was tempered by philosophy and a love of country, rare among professional politicians. Burke was the founder of modern conservative philosophy. Confronted with the destructive forces of the French Revolution, his whole life was passed in reconciling the conflicting elements of order and progress. Lord Elgin is a Radical and a Home Ruler. It would almost seem that in this matter the Conservatism of the last century was really more sound and progressive than the Liberalism of the present. It is remarkable that only a year before this exposition of the mandate theory, a very different exposition had been heard of the same theory in the Council Chamber of the Bengal Legislative Council. It was on the eve of the enlargement of the Council. Popular constituencies were about to be formed. Mandates might be issued by these constituencies upon their representatives. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. Sir Charles Elliott took time by the forelock, as he always did when he was in office, and warned would-be-representatives against the contingency of mandates being issued by their constituents. Thus he observed:

from his place in the Bengal Council on the 25th February, 1893 :

We are now on the eve of an important reconstruction of this Council the details of which are at present unknown. But we are aware that there will be a considerable extension and expansion of the principle of representation, and I think it very important that it should be understood to what extent and of what character the representation ought to be. I do not venture to forecast what orders we may receive from the Secretary of State or from the Government of India on this subject, but I wish most emphatically to record my agreement with what has fallen from the Advocate-General, that, however much a Member of this Council may be a representative of any Corporation, or of any interest, or of any body or Association existing in these provinces, he will, on his appointment as a Member of this Council, act according to his lights and according to his conscience. His position ought not to be that of a delegate, and he ought not to be called upon to record his vote in accordance with the views of constituents whom he represents, unless he heartily and personally agrees with them.

Whose authority are we to accept, that of the Viceroy or his late Lieutenant? It is seldom that we find Sir Charles Elliott on the popular side. When he is with us, we may be quite sure that we have exceptionally good reasons for thinking that we are in the right.

Somehow or other, Secretaries of State, and before them the Board of Control, have been wedded to this mandate theory. They have claimed this right from time to time. The Duke of Argyle in a despatch, dated the 24th November 1870, maintained that,

the Government of India were mere Executive Officers of the Home Government who had the ultimate power of requiring the Governor-General to introduce a measure and of requiring also all the official Members of the Council to vote for it.

The theory has, however, been always strenuously resisted by the independent Members of Council, and by none more strenuously than by Sir Barnes Peacock, perhaps the greatest English lawyer who ever set foot on Indian soil. He said :

He had always understood and he still held, that the office of a Member of Council was a high and honourable one ; but if he believed that the constitution of this Council was such that its

members were bound to legislate in any manner that either the Board of Control or the Honourable Court of Directors might order, he should say that instead of being a high and honourable office, it was one which no man who had a regard for his own honour and independence could consent to hold; for his own part he would state freely and without hesitation that he would rather resign his office than hold it on that tenure. . . . He believed that the trust and duty committed to every Member of the Legislative Council was to act according to his own judgment and conscience.

INDIA'S FINANCIAL POSITION

If your Legislative Councils are an important matter for your consideration, your finances form the backbone of your administration. Tell me, said John Bright in substance, in one of his speeches, what the financial condition of a country is and I will tell you all about its Government and the condition of its people. The financial test is the most crucial. Judged by it our position is truly deplorable. It is no exaggeration to say that the financial position of India is one of ever-recurring deficit, and of ever-increasing debt. I should be sorry to say one word which would convey to the mind of any one an exaggerated notion of the difficulties by which the Government of India is surrounded. Let there be "naught extenuate or ought set down in malice". But I think I am strictly within the limits of truth when I say that, so far as our financial position is concerned, debt and deficit represent the order of the day. Let me ask you to follow me as I rapidly glance over a few facts and figures in connection with the financial history of the sixty years from 1834 to 1894. During this period you have had 34 years of deficit amounting in round numbers to 83 crores of rupees and 26 years of surplus amounting to 42 crores of rupees, in round numbers, with the net result that you have a net deficit of about 41 crores of rupees, which makes an average of deficits of something over sixty-five lakhs of rupees per year. Our debt kept pace with our deficit. They are twin sisters which march apace. It must be so in the nature of things. An ever-increasing deficit must produce an ever-accumulating debt. During the same

period the Public Debt increased from 26 crores to 210 crores; and 42 crores of this amount were incurred within the last ten years. If we are not bankrupts, at any rate, we are on the high road to it. If an ordinary individual found that his expenditure was steadily increasing, that income was not increasing in the same proportion, that his resources were strained to the utmost, and that his debt was fast accumulating, he would feel that he was perilously near bankruptcy. But I suppose Governments are not like ordinary mortals. They do not participate in the common feelings and the common failings of our ordinary human nature—and hence the optimism of our rulers.

INCREASE OF MILITARY EXPENDITURE

What is it that has brought the country to its present deplorable financial position? The answer must be that it is in the main the aggressive military policy of the Government. The depreciated rupee has much to answer for; it is responsible for many sins of omission and commission, but it is not wholly nor even mainly chargeable with the present financial embarrassments of the Government. Sir Auckland Colvin in a recent article in the *Nineteenth Century* observes that the increase of Indian expenditure from 1883-84 to 1892-93, amounting to about 11 crores of rupees, was due to three causes, and he regards the military charges as the first and the foremost of these *vide* page 873, the *Nineteenth Century* for November. In the course of the same article, he observes :

There can be no improvement in Indian finances so long as Indian revenues are depleted by the claims of frontier extension, or exposed to the risk and requirements of war.

Fall in the exchange and the abnormal activity in the State construction of railways on a gold basis, when the exchange value of silver is rapidly falling, are, in the opinion of Sir Auckland Colvin, the other and less effective cause of this increased expenditure. Sir William Harcourt, in the course of a recent debate on Chitral, held that the additional military charges were among the elements

which have disorganised Indian finance. Let me quote his words :

The question of the ability of India to bear a burden of this character is a very serious question. We all know with reference to the expedition to Afghanistan that there was a large addition made some years ago to the Indian Army, and that addition to the Army was among the elements which have led to the financial difficulties of India.

The British Committee of the National Congress took substantially the same view of the matter. In a Note which they circulated, they held that it was not exchange so much as the increase in Civil and Military expenditure which was responsible for the financial difficulties of the Government of India. Sir James Westland accused the Committee of having committed "a gigantic blunder". The Committee came back to the attack and showed that their mistake was not a huge blunder, and that it was due to the system of accounts sanctioned by the authority of the Indian Finance Department, over which Sir James Westland presided. They further pointed out that "the expenditure on the Civil and Military Services exhibits the large increase of Rs. 8,54,346 apart from any increase in exchange".

It is not then exchange—it is not some economic monster over which the Government of India has no control and which cannot be disposed of by the closing of the Mints—that is responsible for the present deplorable condition of Indian finance. It is in the main the military policy pursued by the Government which has brought us to our present position. The military charges have steadily increased. At the time of the Indian Mutiny with an army of 240,000 men, the military expenditure of the country came up to 11 crores of rupees. In 1864, with a reduced army the expenditure was 14 crores of rupees. In the meantime the amalgamation scheme between the Indian Government and the War Office had been carried out—that contract had been entered into which, in the felicitous language of the late Mr. Fawcett, was a contract between a dwarf and a giant, in which of course the dwarf went to the wall. In 1884, with an

army of 189,000 men; the expenditure came up to 17 crores of rupees; in 1895-96, it is 20 crores of rupees exclusive of exchange. In March 1885, Sir Auckland Colvin, speaking from his place as Finance Minister, estimated the net cost of the Army (exclusive of exchange) at 150,000,000 of rupees. This amount he considered to be about the normal expenditure in India and in England. If we add another crore of rupees (excluding exchange) for military works, not taking into account special defence works, the net military expenditure may be fixed at 16 crores of rupees. Now within the last 20 years this normal expenditure has been exceeded by more than 50 crores of rupees. Let me give you the rough details :

	Rs.
Afghan War ...	1,15,00,000
Annexation of Upper Burma ...	40,00,000
Increase in Army (9 full years) ...	1,35,00,000
Expeditions, Increased Ex- penditure, Occupation of Upper Burma, etc. }	2,28,00,000
Rs. ...	5,18,00,000

CHITRAL EXPEDITION

This policy, so disastrous to the financial interests of India, is being followed by our rulers with unabated zeal; and the most recent illustration of it is afforded by the annexation of Chitral. The expedition to Chitral was condemned by the Indian Press with singular unanimity. But whatever justification there might have been for the expedition, there is absolutely none for the permanent occupation of the country. In the proclamation issued by the Government, there was a distinct promise that when the object of the expedition had been attained, the forces would be withdrawn. I quote the exact words of the Proclamation :

The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present and to prevent any future unlawful aggression on Chitral territory; and as soon as the object has been attained the forces will be withdrawn.

Thus was a solemn declaration made before all India that after the object of the expedition had been attained, which was the relief of the beleaguered garrison and the protection of Chitral against any present and future troubles, the Army would be withdrawn. I must express my unqualified surprise that with this declaration before it, to the faithful observance of which the honour of the Government was pledged, the Government of India with Lord Elgin at its head should have unanimously recommended the occupation of the country. I desire to place the moral consideration in the forefront (*cheers*); that which is morally indefensible cannot be politically expedient. (*Hear, hear.*) Politics divorced from morality is no politics at all (*cheers*); it is political jugglery of the worst description. It is not for one moment to be supposed that the semi-civilized races, who have thus been treated, whose forbearance and neutrality was secured by a promise made to be broken, are insensible to the binding character of a moral obligation (*Hear, hear.*) They will feel the wrong and the insult; they will brood over the injustice which, in the words of Carlyle, never fails to "revenge itself with compound interest". (*Hear, hear.*) What explanation has the Government of India to offer in support of its policy? I have not heard of any, except the halting and lame defence that was put forward by the Prime Minister from his place in Parliament. The annexation was sought to be justified on grounds of moral, if not of physical, strategy. It was said that if the troops were withdrawn and the country was abandoned, it would involve loss of prestige and produce a detrimental effect upon the minds of the tribes. It seems to me, with all deference, that the Prime Minister's moral strategy is very much wide of the mark. Moral strategy inconsistent with moral principles is a very poor sort of strategy. (*Hear, hear.*) If the tribes are human beings—I suppose they are—(*laughter*) with human instincts and feelings, this breach of a solemn promise will have a far more detrimental effect than what might be supposed to be produced by the alleged loss of prestige, consequent upon the withdrawal of the troops. It will alienate their sympathies and convert them

into discontented allies or open foes. If this be one of the objects which is sought to be attained by the new code of moral strategy, I have nothing to say to it.

CHITRAL EXPEDITION IN ITS FINANCIAL ASPECT

But what about the financial aspect of the question? That is the consideration which presses most upon us. From this point of view its gravity cannot be over-estimated. When the expedition started last summer, it was stated, confidently stated, that 15 lakhs of rupees would suffice to cover all expenses. Wise men shook their heads. But all doubts and misgivings gave way for the time at least before the positive assurances of the Government and its organs in the Press. Have these confident predictions been fulfilled? How many fifteen lakhs of rupees have been spent upon the expedition, it is difficult to say; but this ludicrously low estimate serves to indicate the want of foresight which is sometimes displayed by the Financial Department in dealing with estimates. In India, the public memory is notoriously short; but we have not yet quite forgotten the story of the missing four crores which had disappeared amid the mountain-passes of Afghanistan, and which the Financial Department was at its wit's end to discover. The estimate was fixed at 15 lakhs of rupees, but the expedition, it is believed, has cost nearly two crores of rupees; and the further question occurs—will not the occupation of Chitral involve an addition to the Indian Army and to the already excessive military expenditure of the Empire? Mr. Balfour, in the course of the discussion which took place in the House of Commons in September last, gave the assurance that there would be “no addition to the Indian Army”.

The Indian Government inform us categorically, he went on to observe, that the existing body of troops in India would suffice to meet every necessity. The garrison force in Gilgit will be diminished; there will be re-distribution of troops but no addition will be required.

The obvious retort, to which the explanation is liable, is that if Chitral could be occupied without any addition to the forces, the Indian Government had at its disposal an

overgrown Army in excess of the requirements of the country. However that may be, can we rely upon this assurance? Can we rely upon the ever-shifting phases of Central Asian politics? We will not say that the Government will deliberately depart from an assurance thus solemnly given, but the Government may be driven into a position by reason of the occupation of Chitral, which may compel the Government to add to the Army and the Military expenditure of the Empire. It is impossible to say what may or may not happen in Central Asian politics. A forward movement on the frontier involves the Government in indefinite responsibilities which it is impossible to foresee and calculate upon with confidence. Thus observed Lord Lawrence many, many years ago :

We foresee no limits to the expenditure which such a move (a forward move) might require; and we protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India, who are unwilling, as it is, to bear such pressure for measures which they can both understand and appreciate. . . . our true policy, our strongest security will be found to be in the contentment, if not in the attachment, of the masses . . . in husbanding our finances and consolidating and multiplying our resources.

THE FRONTIER POLICY

Times without number have we in Congress assembled under the guidance of my esteemed friend, Mr. Wacha whose knowledge of details is only surpassed by his zeal for the public good, protested against the extravagant military expenditure of the Government. The Government is in quest of a scientific frontier, by which we understand a frontier which is better capable of being defended against a foreign invader than a frontier which is not scientific. But, as Colonel Hanna has pointed out in a little book on frontier policy which I would like to recommend to you, that which is scientific is fixed and definite. What is scientific to-day cannot be unscientific to-morrow. A scientific frontier cannot constantly be receding in the distance like the *ignis fatuus*, as you advance towards it. Let me tell the

Government of India, in your name, that the true scientific frontier against Russian invasion does not lie in some remote inaccessible mountain which has yet to be discovered, nor is it to be found in the House of Commons as some one said; but it lies deep in the grateful hearts of a loyal and contented people. If India is loyal and grateful, and is united by a common sentiment of devotion to British rule, resolved to die in its defence, India can raise a barrier which will defy the efforts of the most powerful foreign invader who yet has desecrated our territories. Where have you heard of a foreign invader being triumphant against the efforts of a united people, and of a people too like ourselves, as countless as the stars of heaven, and as multitudinous as the sands of the sea. I have heard of this Russian invasion since the days of my childhood. The Russians have not come. They never will come; and if they do come, and if India is loyal and united, then they will find behind the serried ranks of one of the finest armies in the world, the multitudinous races and peoples of India united as one man ready to die for the Sovereign and in the defence of their hearths and homes. But I am bound to add that the Government is alienating the sympathies of the people by wasting their resources upon these frontier wars. The commonest domestic improvements are starved, the most urgent domestic reforms are postponed through want of funds. But when it comes to a question of granting a subsidy to some frontier chief, or embarking upon some frontier expedition, or entertaining the son of a Prince who has been useful to us in frontier politics, then our Government is as rich as the richest Government in the world.

But we are in excellent company in condemning the forward policy which is now in the ascendant in the Councils of the Government. Some of the most distinguished statesmen who have adorned the annals of modern Indian history, one of them intimately acquainted with frontier affairs, to whose foresight the salvation of the Empire was due at a critical time, have repeatedly warned the Government to confine their attention to within their

own dominions, and to devote themselves to the improvement of the condition of the people. This was what Lord Lawrence wrote :

Taking every view, then, of this great question—the progress of Russia in Central Asia, the effect it will, in course of time, have upon India, the arrangements which we should have to make meet is—I am firmly of opinion that our proper course is not to advance our troops beyond our present border, nor to send English officers into the different States of Central Asia, but to put our own house in order by giving the people of India the best government in our power, by conciliating, as far as practicable, all classes, and by consolidating our resources.

Lord Lawrence's advice was "to put our house in order by giving the people of India the best form of Government in our power, and by conciliating all classes". The same views, if not expressed in the same words, were shared by a host of other eminent statesmen and soldiers, among whom I may mention the names of Lord Canning, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook, Sir Henry Norman, Sir Henry Durand, Sir William Muir, and last though not least, Sir William Mansfield, afterwards Lord Sandhurst, the father of your excellent Governor.

EXPENSIVE MILITARY PROGRAMME

Are these ideas to be regarded as old-fashioned and antiquated? Have circumstances so changed as to call for a complete change, and not only a change but an absolute reversal of the policy of masterly inactivity associated with the honoured name of Lord Lawrence? I do not think so. The circumstances connected with the border politics have perhaps undergone some change, but not such as to require the adoption of a spirited frontier policy, leading to a sensible addition to the Indian Army and to numerous petty little wars which have completely disorganised our finances. The Simla Army Commission which submitted its Report in 1884 recognized this change, but nevertheless did not recommend any addition to the Indian Army. The Commission considered the Army, such as it then was, sufficient for all purposes of offensive and defensive operations. What is it, then, that has brought about the change—this radical and

fundamental change in the policy of our rulers? It was the Penjdeh incident which upset the equanimity of the Government, and plunged the country into an expensive Military programme, which has brought the Indian Government to the verge of bankruptcy. It was immediately followed by the addition of thirty thousand men to the Army. As Sir Auckland Colvin has observed, what were our rulers to do with such a fine and splendidly organised Army if they did not occasionally indulge in the luxury of a frontier expedition, at the expense of the Indian taxpayer? In all conscience the temptation is great; and the late Sir William Mansfield, afterwards Lord Sandhurst, went so far as to observe that the real cause of the agitation set on foot in his time for an aggressive policy "was what might be styled Brevet Mania or K. C. B. Mania rather than Russophobia".

INDIAN FINANCE AND THE HOME CHARGES

In dealing with the question of Indian Finance, the Home Charges loom largely in view. They have gone on steadily increasing. In ten years they have risen over 30 per cent. In 1882, they were Rs. 17,366,000. In 1892, they were Rs. 22,911,000. They have been the subject of adverse comment by successive Viceroy. Charges are thrown upon us which should be borne by the Home Treasury, or in respect of which there should be an adjustment between the Home and the Indian Treasuries. Charges are thrown upon us, which, or charges similar to which, in the case of the free and independent Colonies, are borne by the Home Government. We paid £500,000 for the construction of the India Office in London. The Home Government paid £100,000 for the construction of the Colonial Office in London. Can anybody tell me why the Colonial Office cost £100,000 in the construction and the India Office £500,000? Did it make any difference that the one was paid for out of our money and the other out of the money of the English taxpayer, who can look after his purse and can control the public expenditure? But let us proceed. We pay all the charges of the India Office in London amounting to £230,000 a year. The Home

Government pays £41,000 for the Colonial Office in London. We pay £12,500 a year for the maintenance of the Chinese Legation, and £7,000 a year for the Persian Legation. The cost of the Residency in Turkish Arabia and of the Consulate in Bagdad, amounting to Rs. 1,72,360 is entirely paid from the Indian revenues, as if England in her Imperial relations was in no way interested in their maintenance. Is not Bagdad one of the headquarters of Central Asian politics—the focus of intrigue in that part of the world? And is not England interested in the maintenance of the Consulate there?

The economic aspect of this question is not to be overlooked. England does not levy any direct tribute upon India. But these Home Charges operate in the nature of a tribute. As Sir George Wingate very properly observed many, many years ago in connection with these Home Charges :

The taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in their effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. . . . In this case, they constitute no mere transfer of one portion of the national income from one set of citizens to another, but are an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount drawn from the taxed country.

The Home Charges constitute a serious drain, and add to the ever-increasing poverty of the country. But it is no use repeating the old complaint. We must be prepared to formulate definite proposals in this connection for the consideration of Government. I cordially endorse the view which has been put forward by a writer in the columns of *India*, to the effect that the Home Government should bear a portion of the Home Charges. I trust the Royal Commission now enquiring into Indian Expenditure will see its way to make a recommendation to that effect. This would be nothing but fair and just, and what is due to the interests of India.

INDIA'S SHARE IN FIGHTING FOR THE EMPIRE

We have fought the wars of England in the past with our blood and treasure. In the Abyssinian Expedition, it was we who fought and bled; it was the Indian

Government which spent its treasure and sacrificed the lives of its brave soldiers. It was your Bombay troops who, in the somewhat pompous language of Mr. Benjamin Disraeli, "planted the standard of St. George on the heights of Rasselas". In the Afghan wars in Lord Lytton's time India bore the entire expense, save and except a sum of five millions sterling, contributed by Mr. Gladstone's Government.

In Central Asian Policy, a policy in which India alone is interested? Does it not affect the Imperial relations of England as a great Asiatic, and even as a great European, power? It is true we are interested—largely interested—but we are not solely and exclusively interested. Why, then, should we alone be required to pay towards the promotion of schemes and projects, of wars and negotiations, of commissions and entertainments to Royal Princes which are due to the requirements of Imperial policy? When many years ago, I think it was in the sixties, the Sultan of Turkey was entertained at our expense, the Government stated in reply to a question that the money has been paid out of the Indian Treasury, as it was believed that the entertainment would be gratifying to the Mahomedan subjects of Her Majesty. Is it proposed to justify on the same principle the entire burden of the Nasarulla entertainment being thrown on the Indian Exchequer? No explanation has been given on this score, though Sir William Wedderburn pressed hard to bring about a division of the expenditure between the two countries. Sirdar Nasarulla went to England as the guest of the English people—and at the invitation of the British Government. If there was any policy underlying this personal matter, it was one solely prompted by the exigencies of England's Imperial position. If so, was it just and generous for a great and rich Government like that of England to saddle a poverty-stricken country like India with the entire cost of the entertainment? It is a small matter. But if in a paltry affair like this, there is an utter absence of the spirit of fairness and of a desire to do strict justice in dealing with the finances of an unrepresented dependency,

what may we not expect in matters of greater moment?
(*Cheers.*)

APPORTIONMENT OF HOME CHARGES

~~THE~~ The apportionment of the Home Charges between England and India would not only be just, but is desirable from another point of view. At the present moment nobody seems to be responsible for Indian finance. In the felicitous language of the late Mr. George Yule, whose memory this Congress holds in high honour, India was a trust committed by Providence to the care of Parliament. Parliament has thrown the trust back upon Providence. In the Indian Legislative Council the debate on the Budget is more or less academic in his character. The members cannot move any resolution in respect of it. In Parliament, the Indian Budget is introduced at the fag-end of the session, and is discussed before empty benches. No English Minister would dare to deal with the English Budget in this way; but if the English Treasury made a contribution to the Home Charges, we may be quite sure the British taxpayer would insist upon a scrutiny as to how the money was spent, and the British Member of Parliament, now usually so apathetic with regard to Indian affairs, would be responsive to the call of his constituents. The real and genuine, and not the mere nominal, control of the English Parliament would thus be secured. This would be an advantage worth having, for we have unstinted confidence in the justice and generosity of the British people and their representatives in Parliament.

POVERTY OF INDIA

The poverty of the masses of our countrymen has been the theme of endless discussion here and elsewhere. We know what the views of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji are. He holds that the average income per head of the population in India is Rs. 20, against Lord Cromer's estimate of Rs. 27 a year. Whether it is Rs. 20 or Rs. 27 per head makes no difference. It is striking evidence of the deplorable poverty of the masses of our population If

you compare the economic condition of the masses of our people with that of more fortunately situated countries in Europe, this truth forces itself upon our attention with painful impressiveness. Lord Cromer is my authority. Lord Cromer, then Sir Evelyn Baring, gave some figures in 1882, which throw a lurid light upon the economic condition of our people. The average income of the population per head in Great Britain was estimated by him at £33 a year: in France it was £23; in Turkey, which is the poorest country in Europe, it was £4. Mulhal gives the income per head of the Russian population at £9. Upon this income of £33, the English taxpayer pays a tax of £2-12 per head; the Indian taxpayer upon his income of Rs. 20 or Rs. 27 a year, pays a tax of 2s. 6d. per head. The English taxpayer thus pays a tax of 7 per cent. upon his income of £33, while the Indian taxpayer pays a tax of 5 per cent. upon his income of Rs. 27. It will be readily admitted that five per cent. upon an income of Rs. 27 is a much more serious matter—involves a much heavier sacrifice—than 7 per cent. upon an income of £33. I ask you to bear in mind one little consideration. The average calculation is made by dividing the whole income of the community, whatever it may be, among the heads of population. But it is, after all, an average. There must be a large number whose income is below the average, as there must be a large number whose income is above it, I ask you for one moment to consider what must be the condition in life of that large number of people whose income is below Rs. 27 a year?

It is no wonder, then, that 40 millions of our people live upon one meal a day, as stated by Sir William Hunter, or that we have those periodical famines which decimate thousands and hundreds of thousands of our population. Cuvier has remarked that famines are impossible in this age. So they are in European countries, but not in this hapless land of ours, which a great orator in the last century described as "the garden of Asia, the granary of the East". We must all note with thankfulness that an influential journal like the *Pioneer*, supposed to be the

exponent of official opinion, takes the popular view of the matter. That journal freely admits :

That the masses in India are poor, very poor; that our administration is an expensive one; that money is often wasted in enterprises like the Chitral imbroglio, and that, in various directions without administrative injury, economy and retrenchment might be enforced.

INDIAN POVERTY AND THE SALVATION ARMY

I am glad to find that the Salvation Army have had their attention prominently called to the poverty-stricken condition of our masses. With an all-comprehensive philanthropy which does honour to their Christianity, they have not forgotten the Indian poor. Their scheme for the reclamation of the submerged tenth will include our submerged fifth. Their scheme for Indian peasant-settlements is well worth consideration; and whatever we may think of its details, our sympathies must go forth on behalf of a project, so noble, so generous, so full of the spirit of true Christian charity.

IMPORT DUTIES ON COTTON GOODS

Upon this miserable income of Rs. 27 a year, the native of India has to pay a tax of 5 per cent., while the Englishman with an average annual income of £33, pays only a tax of 7½ per cent. The furthest limits of taxation have indeed been reached. The import duties on cotton goods, which had been abolished in Lord Ripon's time, had to be re-imposed to meet the exigencies of an impecunious Government. This was an extreme step which no Government anxious to secure the votes of Lancashire would take except under a sense of supreme and imperious necessity. That the duties should have been re-imposed is evidence of the financial crisis to which the country has been reduced. The duties are not meant to be protective; they never were protective in their character. They were levied for revenue purposes; they are now levied for revenue. There is not a more earnest advocate of Free Trade than Mr. Gladstone. He was a Member of the Government of Sir Robert Peel when the principles of Free Trade were for

the first time recognised by an English Government in the administrative measures of the country. Mr. Gladstone strongly opposed the partial repeal of these duties in Lord Lytton's time, on the ground that if they militated against the principles of Free Trade, the financial condition of the Government was an essential element in the consideration. From his place in Parliament, he thus denounced the repeal of the duties :

What an invidious, almost odious, picture of inequality we exhibit to the millions of India. The Free Trade doctrines that we hold so dear, that we apply them against the feelings of the Indian people in their utmost rigour and without a grain of mercy, disappear in a moment when it is a question of dealing with those whose interest and opinions we cannot lightly tamper with, namely, the free colonists of the empire. The Governor-General says he cannot see that financial difficulty can in any way be pleaded as a reason against what he calls fiscal reform. If that be a true principle of Government, it has been discovered for the first time by the present Viceroy. There has not been a Free-Trade Government in this or any country which has not freely admitted that the state of the revenue is an essential element in the consideration of the application even of the best principle of Free Trade.

I am free to admit there is some protection involved in allowing Indian yarn only to be taxed above 20's count, and imposing a duty upon all descriptions of cloth and yarn imported from the United Kingdom. But the measure of this protection is infinitesimal when you bear in mind that the duty on cloth and yarn imported of 20's count and under, according to the estimate of Mr. O'Connor, is about four lakhs out of a total of about a crore-and-a-half. Manchester imports but little of these coarser fabrics; there is little or no competition here; nobody perhaps would object if these four lakhs of rupees were abandoned by exempting from duty all imported yarn and cloth of 20's count and under. For myself I would prefer a remission of the salt duties to this remission of the import duties.

But Manchester has another grievance. While only Indian yarns of the finer kind are taxed, all cotton fabrics of the finer sort imported from England are taxed. The Government charges more upon the manufactured goods

than upon the yarns. To that extent, the finer cloths which are imported are handicapped against Indian goods of the same class. To that extent there is protection. This may be easily remedied by fixing a lower duty upon these manufactured goods imported from England, say a duty of four per cent. instead of five per cent.

What the ultimate fate of these duties will be, it is difficult to say. Manchester is vigorously agitating for their repeal. The present Secretary of State, Lord George Hamilton, had indeed strongly denounced the imposition of these duties from his place in Parliament, while he was a Member of the Opposition. The supporters of the duties were politely told by his Lordship that they were so many "shrieking units" of the Indian community who chiefly lived in the metropolitan towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay—I am quoting from memory, I cannot be sure whether Poona was included—and who had learnt the methods of Western agitation, but that their opinion was in no way to be confounded with the opinion of the great body of the people. By a strange irony of fate, his Lordship has apparently joined hands with "the shrieking units", whom he had not long ago so vigorously denounced. It is very evident from his recent utterances that, while, as he tells us, he firmly adheres to his former views, he does not see his way to gratify the wishes of Lancashire. He is waiting for the Despatches of the Government of India on the subject. The elections are over. There is a long time yet to think of the next elections, and in the meantime many things may happen. If Manchester has a grievance, and there can be no doubt that she feels she has a grievance, let her agitate for financial justice to India, and she will command the sympathies of educated India.

EXCHANGE COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE

From one point of view, Manchester has indeed a grievance. The duties are levied, and yet Exchange Compensation Allowance is granted to the European officials of the Government. Practically, the proceeds of the duties are paid as compensation allowance. The

proceeds of the duties come up to about a crore-and-a-half a year. The disbursements under Exchange Compensation Allowance come up to about the same sum. Abolish the Exchange Compensation allowance, and you need not impose the duties. As between the two, I would rather abolish the duties than grant Exchange Compensation Allowance. If the allowance was made upon actual remittances sent to England, or if it was granted only to such officials as had joined the service before the rapid fall in the rupee had set in, there might be some show of a justification. As it is, it constitutes an invidious and irritating distinction between the European and the non-European officials of the Government. According to the most recent explanation given by Lord George Hamilton, the object of the Exchange Compensation Allowance is to afford European servants of the Government the opportunity of making remittances Home and providing themselves with the English-made articles. Whether they do so or not is quite another matter.

Exchange Compensation Allowance seems to me to be useless for the purpose for which it is granted. It is not a sufficient inducement to the senior officers to continue after their term of service has been completed; while the popularity of the Indian Civil Service among the educated youth in England, notwithstanding the rapid fall in the Exchange, may be judged from the fact that three English candidates who had recently qualified themselves both for the Home as well as the Indian Civil Service, preferred the latter.

The grant of Exchange Compensation Allowance to the highly-paid officers of the Government lays our rulers open to a serious complaint. It is said that these high officers of Government who are the masters of the situation, have quietly added to their own salaries, while the humbler classes of public servants who can hardly make two ends meet, who have to eke out their miserable pittance by resort to practices which will not bear the test of scrutiny, but which dire necessity imposes upon them, still continue to draw salaries which were fixed

many, many years ago. In Bengal, a Salaries Commission consisting of some of the highest officials in the land, was appointed in 1885. They submitted their Report in 1886. They recommended, having regard to the rise in the price of food-grains, that an increase of at least 75 per cent. should be made to the pay of the ministerial servants of the Government. The recommendation has not been given effect to: it remains a dead letter. The question was prominently brought to the notice of the Lieutenant-Governor at the meeting of the Local Council when the Budget was discussed in April last. His Honour expressed sympathy with the proposal, but I am not aware that the matter has gone beyond the stage of a mere expression of a pious hope that some day, under better auspices and in more favourable times, the evil might be remedied. In the meantime, my information is that the peons of the various Government offices, drawing wages varying from seven to ten rupees a month, and who had applied for increase, were told by Sir Charles Elliot that he could not grant their request, because forsooth, in August and September last, the price of common rice had gone down, and more than 12 seers of rice could be had for the rupee.

INDIAN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Ours is a political organization; but we cannot overlook considerations which affect the development of our industries and our manufactures. The economic condition of a people has an intimate bearing upon their political advancement. Looking at the matter from this point of view, we feel that it is our duty to safeguard our industries. Their conservation is a matter of grave national importance. We have our cotton industry in Bombay, the jute industry in Bengal, the tea industry in Assam, and the coal and iron industries in Central and Southern India. Factory Acts which have hitherto been understood to be framed for the protection of operatives, are now sought to be used for the avowed object of restricting and raising the cost of production.

"Pressure," I understand, "is now to be put upon the Secretary of State to ignore the interests of the people of this

country and to order a Factory Act for India, which will prevent our mills from competing with those in England."

Lancashire people engaged in cotton industry have attacked the cotton industry in India, insisting on a stricter Factory Act and shorter working hours, quite oblivious of the hardships this would obviously entail on the people of India generally, and overlooking the fact that Japan is already a serious rival to India as well as England. Then the jute manufacturing industry has been threatened by the jute manufacturers in Dundee, on the plea that their trade is suffering from the competition of the Indian mills. They too seem to forget the important factor that there are many jute mills on the Continent of Europe and go straight for the Indian mills, because they are under the British Government.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES OF ENQUIRY INTO INDIAN AFFAIRS

I now pass on to consider an important question which must soon engage a large share of public attention. You are aware that under the East India Company, Parliamentary Committees used to be appointed every 20 years on the eve of the renewal of the Charter of the Company. Some of the most beneficent chapters in Indian history are associated with the labours of these Committees. The investigations of the Parliamentary Committee of 1833 led to the enactment of the Charter Act of that year. One of the happy results of the labours of the Parliamentary Committee of 1853 was the throwing open to general competition of the appointment in the Indian Civil Service. Apart from these direct results, these periodical enquiries exercised a healthy influence over the course of Indian administration. Indian officials after all are men, and when they knew that after every 20 years there would be this examination, this scrutiny into Indian affairs, they naturally were careful as to the policy they pursued and as to the details of their administration. Ever since 1853—ever since India has passed under the Government of the Crown—there has not been a Parliamentary Committee of Enquiry into Indian

affairs, with the exception of the abortive Committee that was appointed when Lord Randolph Churchill was Secretary of State. The Committee collapsed almost as soon as it was appointed, owing to the dissolution of Parliament.

THE BRITISH CONGRESS COMMITTEE

It will be my duty later on to refer to the labours of the British Committee and of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. But, at this stage, I may be permitted to observe that the appointment of the Royal Commission was mainly due to their incessant and devoted efforts, and where all so richly deserve our thanks, it would be invidious to mention names. But if I am permitted to refer to any one who in a special degree is entitled to our acknowledgments, it is Sir William Wedderburn, the President of the British Committee. Sir William Wedderburn is well known in this Presidency, but his is a name which is held in universal honour throughout India as that of a fearless, self-sacrificing, and devoted champion of Indian interests. The one idea upon which he has been ceaselessly harping, ever since his retirement from official life made it possible for him to devote himself, according to the natural impulses of his generous heart, to the service of the land of his adoption, was the appointment of a Royal Commission to enquire into Indian expenditure. It formed the theme of his eloquent address from the Presidential chair of the Congress held at Bombay; and at last success has crowned his efforts and those of his colleagues.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION

The Commission is now sitting. We regret the Commission has decided to carry on its deliberations with closed doors. We believe publicity would have materially helped the Commission in the important work in which it is engaged. "Lead, kindly light", is what we need amid "the encircling gloom" that surrounds us. None the less we expect great results from the labours of the Commission. We are confident the labours of the Commission will mark an epoch in the history of our financial relations with

England. Sir Henry Fowler had indeed observed, when the Commission was appointed, that no question of policy would lie within the competence of the Commission. The terms, however, of the appointment do not seem to me to exclude the consideration of the policy which governs the administration of the Civil and Military expenditure of the Empire. The terms are wide enough to include such a consideration. The Commission is appointed to enquire into :

(a) the administration and management of the Military, and enquiry into Civil expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council or of the Government of India; and (b) the apportionment of charges between the Governments of the United Kingdom and India for purposes in which both are interested.

CIVIL AND MILITARY EXPENDITURE

The administration and management of the Civil and Military expenditure of the Empire necessarily includes considerations of policy. To hold otherwise would be to unduly limit the scope of the enquiry, and to restrict it to mere matters of account-keeping. As the *Times* truly says :

Any curtailment of the scope of the Royal Commission's enquiry which might debar reasonable men from coming to a conclusion on these questions would be received with disappointment in England and with deep dissatisfaction throughout India.

THE HOME CHARGES

The second part of the enquiry is, if possible, of still greater importance. It intimately affects the Home Charges. Our complaint is, that the Indian Exchequer is saddled with charges which should not be thrown upon us. It is not a complaint uttered by irresponsible critics in the Press, but it is a complaint to which statesmen of the eminence of Duke of Argyll, Lord Northbrook, and others have lent the weight of their names. I have no right to anticipate the decision of the Commission, but I am sure I re-echo your sentiments when I say that the people of India appeal to the Commission for justice, for that financial justice, for which they have cried so often, but have hitherto cried in vain.

We too have a duty to perform in this connection. Three Members of the British Committee are on the Commission. We know how nobly they are doing their work. But our side of the case must be represented, and adequately represented. The Commission must be placed in touch with popular opinion in India. In this matter I am happy to be able to say that we are in complete accord with our Anglo-Indian fellow-subjects. In the whole compass of the political literature of the last ten years, there is nothing more searching, yet more discriminating, than Sir Griffith Evans' criticism on the Home Charges. Every Association in the country ought to send representations to the Commission, bearing on the question of Indian expenditure, and on the adjustment of charges between India and England. There should go forth from us an unequivocal and emphatic demonstration against the present system by which England throws upon India charges incidental to her Imperial responsibility, and which in equity ought to be shared between the two countries, with some reference not only to the mutual benefits derived, but also to the capacity of each country to bear the burden.

WIDER EMPLOYMENT OF INDIANS IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

The question of the wider employment of our countrymen in the public service is, to my mind, more or less a financial problem. It is intimately connected with the question of the poverty of the people. That is the view of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji; that was the view of the late Mr. Robert Knight, than whom there was not an abler financial expert or a more ardent friend of the people of India. The considerations bearing upon this point are obvious. The more of the foreign element there is in the public service, with the high pay which must necessarily be given to them for service in a foreign country, the more you widen and deepen that channel by which the wealth of the country flows out—the greater is the impetus you give to that drain which is going on and which has gone on for the last hundred years and more, and which is more or less incidental to the present state of things. A part of the salaries of these highly-paid officials must be spent out of

the country, for the support of their wives and children, while they are yet in the service; and when they have retired, the whole of their pensions, with exceptions which hardly call for notice, must be spent abroad. This means the loss of this portion of the national wealth which is absolutely indefensible, if substantially service of the same quality could be obtained by employing the children of the soil. The employment of a foreign element in the public service of a country, with the prospect of the salaries of these public servants leaving the country, is morally wrong, economically disastrous, and politically inexpedient, unless it is evident that the gain in other respects outweighs the financial loss, or in the end averts greater financial loss than what is incidental to the employment of the foreign agency. (*Hear, hear.*)

BRITISH CAPITAL AND INDIA'S RESOURCES

We fully recognize the fact that British capital has been sunk in the development of the resources of the country. We are grateful to British capitalists for the boon. Their enterprise has afforded us great advantages; it has given an impetus to trade and commerce, it has facilitated intercourse between the most distant parts of the empire; has annihilated time and space. But in regard to the great railway undertakings, to which I chiefly refer, the capital is English, mostly in gold, which adds to the unfavourable exchange, the higher employees are English, the bulk of the profits goes to England. The drain continues, though undoubtedly the resources of the country being developed, it is better able to bear the strain.

SOLEMN PROMISES OF THE SOVEREIGN

In asking for the wider employment of our countrymen in the public service, we not only take our stand upon the solemn promises of our Sovereign, which we cherish with the most affectionate ardour, but we rely upon high considerations of expediency. We are interested in the solvency of the Empire—in the financial stability of the Government; for with it are bound up the happiness and prosperity of our people. Therefore it is that we make this demand. The financial consideration runs through it all.

POVERTY OF INDIA

Abject, deplorable poverty is the prolific parent of public disorders. A people groaning under an intolerable load of poverty, with whom existence is a burden, have no interest in the maintenance of the public tranquillity ; there is no project, however wild or reckless or inconsistent with the public interests, which in their desperation they might not adopt. I need not quote familiar instances in the history of the world. Oriental nature is not materially different from human nature in other parts of the world.

TENSION BETWEEN HINDUS AND MAHOMEDANS

We all deplore the recent disturbances between Hindus and Mahomedans. We would give worlds to avert them. They throw back the cause of political advancement. But how rare is it that we find respectable people mixed up in these disturbances. People who have anything to lose will not expose themselves to the risk. Those who have nothing to lose, with whom existence is one long incessant struggle, would dare all things and do all things. A people steeped in poverty represents a political danger, the magnitude of which it is difficult to exaggerate.

PUBLIC SERVICE QUESTION

How does this public service question stand? The Resolution of the House of Commons of the 2nd June, 1893, in favour of Simultaneous Examinations, stands there in the journals of the House. It has not been cancelled. Nor has it been given effect to. What has happened since we met last? A number of petitions has been presented to the House in support of the Resolution to which I have referred, but not as many as one might have wished or hoped for, having regard to the importance of the question and the magnitude of our interests therein. I am bound to say that we have not done our duty in this matter. I feel called upon to repeat the appeal I made last year that we should go on presenting petitions to the House of Commons till we get what we want. Let us convince the British public that we are in earnest about this matter, and I am confident that justice will be done to us. It is no

use recording a Resolution here once a year, and then going to sleep over it for the rest of the twelve months.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS IN ENGLAND AND INDIA

Never did the case for Simultaneous Examinations receive a more striking measure of support than from the results of the open Competitive Examination for 1895. There were sixty-six vacancies. There were several Indian candidates. But only one passed, Mr. Shaik Ashgar Ali of the Punjab. In your name I desire to congratulate this gentleman, chiefly because he is a Mahomedan and a native of the Punjab. I should like to put it to the staunchest opponent of Simultaneous Examinations to say if the success of this solitary native of India represents justice—adequate justice to India. The *Pioneer* newspaper, referring to this year's Final Examination, remarked that, having regard to the results, the case for Simultaneous Examinations must now be considered to be hopeless. What are the results which are supposed to justify this inference? A Mahomedan gentleman was at the top of the list at the Final Examination, and three other Indian candidates occupied very high places. But in considering the results of the Final Examination in their bearing upon the question of Simultaneous Examinations, we must also take into account the results of the Open Competitive Examination for the same year; and if we do so, we are forced to the conclusion that they accentuate the necessity for holding Simultaneous Examinations, both as a matter of justice to India, and with a view to ensure the efficiency of the Service.

I desire to put this question of the efficiency of the Civil Service in the foreground. I am distinctly of opinion that Simultaneous Examinations would add to its efficiency and the results of the recent Open Competitive Examination certainly points to that conclusion. Look at the disparity of marks between the successful candidates at the top and those at the bottom of the list, say, between the first

ten and the last ten candidates. As regards the first ten candidates, the marks vary from 2,125 to 3,738; as regards the last ten, the marks vary from 1,493 to 1,587. If these marks are to be regarded as any test or merit, it must be admitted that there was a great and unusual disparity in respect of merit, between the men at the top and the men at the bottom. If a selection could have been made from a wider field, if the examination was held in India as well as in England, it is reasonable to infer that there would have been some chance of this disparity being removed, and perhaps a better class of candidates selected in the place of those occupying the places at the bottom of the list. It is impossible to resist this conclusion, and to that extent it is impossible to shut our eyes to that other conclusion to which it points, that Simultaneous Examinations are calculated to add to the efficiency of the Service, by widening the field of selection. I regard it as a *sin qua non* that the selected candidates should be required to complete their period of probation in England.

One word more before I leave the question of Simultaneous Examinations. One of the objections raised was that if Simultaneous Examinations were granted, it would involve unfairness to the martial races: the Mahomedans and the Sikhs would have no chance. The results of this and last year's examinations afford a complete contradiction to this view of the matter. The only successful Indian candidate at the Open Competitive Examination for 1895, was a Mahomedan gentleman; among the successful candidates for 1894 was a Sikh gentleman; and last, but not least, the candidate who heads the list of passed probationers at the Final Examination for this year is a Mahomedan. Our Mahomedan fellow-countrymen are rapidly coming to the forefront, and I think I express the sense of this Congress when I say that we all await with pleasure the advent of that day when in full association with Hindus and others in their intellectual activities, they will stand shoulder to shoulder with them in that political struggle which will only end when Hindus and

Mahomedans, and Parsis and Sikhs, all races and all creeds in India, will have won for themselves the full rights of British citizenship.

You will remember that the Resolution of the House of Commons did not concern the Covenanted Civil Service alone. It referred to all Civil Services, and it affirmed the principle of Simultaneous Examinations in regard to them all. In Bengal, a qualified sort of Competitive Examination is held for selection to the Office of Assistant and District Superintendents. A similar Examination is held in London. The Examinations are not held simultaneously. They are not held at the same time; nor are the same papers set. That is not, however, what we complain of. We have a much more serious grievance when you consider the matter from another point of view. Natives of India are excluded from these Examinations. They are not allowed to compete. They are to be promoted to the office of Assistant and District Superintendents of Police from among the rank of Inspectors.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I have carefully read the Report of the Public Service Commission. There is absolutely nothing in the recommendations of the Public Service Commission to justify this exclusion. The Commission recommend (*vide* page 121 of their Report) "limited competition amongst candidates selected in England", and similar "competition amongst candidates selected in India". They further say that "endeavours should be made to introduce a reasonable proportion of native officers in the higher ranks of the Police". The grievance to which I refer has formed the subject of representations to the Government of Bengal and the Government of India, but so far without any result.

The Government seems to be of opinion that racial distinctions imply moral distinctions, distinctions of character, which involve the possession of one set of moral qualities rather than another. With the express declaration of the Charter Act of 1833, which lays down that :

• No native of the said territories, nor any natural-born subject of His Majesty resident therein, shall by reason of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them be excluded from any office under the said Company.

With the gracious message of the Queen's Proclamation still ringing in our ears—let me repeat those noble words :

Our subjects of whatever race or creed be freely admitted to all offices the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, their ability, and their integrity duly to discharge.

With this express provision in the Charter Act and with the gracious assurance of our Sovereign—it is too late in the day to fall back upon mere racial considerations. Racial qualifications are not moral qualifications. The Competitive Examination is a better test of moral qualifications than the mere accident of race. It must be so in the nature of things ; for what inequalities of temper, of character and disposition, do we not observe among members of the same race ? This question was thoroughly gone into by the Committee that was appointed with Lord Macaulay at its head, on the eve of the creation of the system of Open Competitive Examinations for appointments to the Indian Civil Service. The Committee submitted its Report, in 1854, to Sir Charles Wood, and in that Report the Committee thus observed :

Early superiority in science and literature generally indicates the existence of some qualities which are securities against vice, industry, self-denial, a taste for pleasures not sensual, a laudable desire of honourable distinction, a still more laudable desire to obtain the approbation of friends and relations. We therefore believe that the intellectual test which is about to be established will be found in practice to be also the best moral test which can be devised.

I should not have thought it necessary to refer to this all but forgotten controversy, were it not that there is a distinct indication of public opinion in some quarters, so notably displayed in the despatches published in the "Blue Book on Simultaneous Examinations", in favour of the system of nomination as against competition—a feeling that competition as between members of the same race is a good test, but is inadequate and ineffectual as a

test, as between members of different races and nationalities. I am free to admit that competition does not represent a perfect test. But there is nothing perfect in this world. Human institutions suffer from the original taint of imperfection. It is the best practicable test we have.

INDIANS' CLAIMS TO ALL COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS

We claim to be admitted to all Competitive Examinations for the Indian Services, no matter to what particular Department of the Public Service they may refer. We claim to be admitted to the Competitive Examinations for the Police Service held in India as well as in England. We claim to be admitted to the Examinations for recruitment to the higher offices in the Forest Department. We are excluded from these Examinations, and we are excluded because we are natives of India. Our disqualification is our race. The crime of colour is alleged against us. We are supposed not to possess the qualities required for these services, by reason of our being members of the race to which it is our misfortune to belong. But there are so many races in India. Do they all suffer from the same disqualification—are they all wanting in the precious qualities required for these services? For, the exclusion applies to them all. A slur is thus cast upon us. But we are not ashamed of our nationality. We are proud that we are Indians; some of us are the inheritors of a civilization which carries the mind back to the dawn of human civilization. But we are also British subjects. *Civis Romanus sum* was the boast of the ancient world. It is our proud privilege to be British subjects, and we claim the rights which belong to our political connection. We are confident that the English people will not permit the perpetuation of invidious distinctions of race in the government of their great Dependency. Themselves free men, all in the enjoyment of equal rights and equal privileges, their natural instinct would be to extend to others the blessings which have made them so great, so happy, and so prosperous.

MILITARY SERVICE AND COLLEGES FOR INDIANS

In this connection it is impossible not to refer to the exclusion of our countrymen from the commissioned ranks in the Army. The bravest native soldier, a born warrior, and though he may have in him the making of a great Captain, cannot in these days rise beyond the rank of a Subedar-Major or a Ressaldar-Major in the British Army. A Sivaji, a Hyder Ali, a Ranjit Singh, a Madhaji Scindia could not now have risen to the position of the Colonel of a Regiment or the Captain of a Company. This ostracism of a whole people, the exclusion of the representatives of the Military races in India from high command in the Army, cannot add to the strength and the stability or the greatness of the Empire. The Romans, the up-builders of the mightiest Empire in the ancient world, followed a different policy. Gibbon says :

But in the eye of the law all Roman citizens were equal, and all the subjects of the Empire were citizens of Rome . . . and the bold adventurer from Germany or Arabia was admitted with equal favour to the Civil or Military command which citizens alone had been once entitled to assume over the conquests of his Fathers (p. 45, Chap. XLIV., Vol. V, "Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire").

Trust in the people, confidence in the ruled, is the secret of successful imperial sway. Never was there a more striking illustration of this truth than in the splendid results which followed the adoption of this policy by Akbar. A stranger to the country, the son of a prince who had been driven from his throne, beset with enormous difficulties at the commencement of his reign, he surmounted them all and founded the mightiest Empire of his time, which for nearly two centuries continued to flourish with undiminished vigour. What was the secret? Where had Akbar learnt it? He loved the people and trusted them. They returned his love with an abundant measure of gratitude which constituted the greatest bulwark of his throne. The grandsons of those who had fought against his grandfather became his ministers, the Rulers of his Provinces, the Captains of his Army. Raja Man Singh carried the Moghul standard from the wilds of Assam to

the mountain passes of Afghanistan. Himself a Hindu, he was made the Governor of the Mahomedan province of Kabul; and he subjugated for his Mahomedan Sovereign the Hindu province of Bengal. Birbal, another Hindu favourite, was sent in charge of an expedition to punish the Yusufzais in Swat, and when the news of his death was brought, his Sovereign shed floods of tears. In the words of Colonel Malleon:

To all alike, whether Uzbek or Afghan, or Hindu, or Parsi, or Christian, he offered careers, provided only that they were faithful, intelligent, true to themselves.

Russian despotism is not indeed to be compared to the benevolent rule of the British in India. But the native subjects of the Czar in Central Asia are admitted to the commissioned ranks in the Army. Here in Congress from year to year we record a Resolution in favour of the establishment of a Military College in India, at which natives of India may be educated and trained for a Military career. I understand that His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, when he was Commander-in-Chief of the Bombay Army, expressed himself in favour of such an institution, as affording a training-ground for the scions of respectable families among the martial races in India, who might aspire to Military distinction. The martial races have done splendid service in the up-building of the Empire. An outlet should be provided for the gratification of their legitimate ambition. Thus wrote the shrewd, the wise, the statesman-like Sir Henry Lawrence many, many years ago:

If Asiatics and Africans can obtain honourable position in the Armies of Russia and France, surely Indians, after a tried service of a century under England's banner, are entitled to the same boon, nay, justice.

SEPARATION OF CIVIL AND MILITARY MEDICAL SERVICES

The question of the separation of the Civil and Military Medical Services will engage your attention. For the agitation in this matter we are indebted to the indefatigable efforts of Dr. Bahadurji and his associates. They have brought it within the range of practical politics,

and, as I learn, have secured the sympathies of so earnest and influential a medical reformer as Dr. Ernest Hart. The question is not a mere professional one. It has a public side to it. The profession is interested, and the public also interested. I have great respect for the Indian Medical Service. The Members of that Service have been the pioneers in this country of the system of medicine as taught in Europe; but it is no disparagement to the Service to say that it is not fit for anything and everything, that it has not the exclusive monopoly of the knowledge of the most recent advances made in medical science, and that professional and scientific work may require special training for which the Service may not afford facilities.

In this connection I may be permitted to refer, on the authority of the *Glasgow Herald*, to a recent ruling by the Secretary of State for India, under which he reserves to himself the discretion to disqualify a candidate for the Indian Medical Service who may have been considered qualified by the examiners. This is what the *Glasgow Herald* says :

Thirty-three candidates, four of whom are natives of India, will compete for sixteen vacancies in the Indian Medical Service on 2nd Proximo. The Secretary of State for India, it should be noted, now has the power of rejecting any candidate who has been successful at the examination. This was not the case until a few months ago. A candidate who succeeded in passing the examination recently, and was able to produce the necessary certificates as to moral character, was objected to by the India Office authorities, but they were compelled to accept him. Immediate authority was, however, sought by the Secretary of State from Parliament, and in future the appointment of any successful competitor who may be considered an undesirable person by the Military Department and Medical Board at the India Office will be vetoed.

We have sufficient confidence in Secretaries of State to feel assured that the discretion here claimed will not be capriciously exercised. But when such a rule does not obtain in respect of any other competitive examination which regulates public appointments in India, the justification for this departure from ordinary practice does not seem to be apparent.

SEPARATION OF EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS

The question of the separation of judicial and executive functions in the administration of criminal justice has always formed a chief plank in the Congress platform. It is one of those questions which we claim to have brought within the range of practical politics. Lord Dufferin declared it to be "a counsel of perfection"; and two successive Secretaries of State, representing the two political parties in England, Lord Cross and Lord Kimberley, both expressed themselves in favour of this reform. The wisdom of the proposal is thus admitted in the abstract. But no serious effort has yet been made to recognize it in the practical work of administration. Mr. R. C. Dutt has showed in his admirable Note, which we have more than once considered in the Congress that the reform may be carried out with little or no extra expenditure. Sir Richard Garth has again and again accentuated the need for the introduction of this reform. Every year cases occur which add to the ever-accumulating evidence on the subject. I desire to make a suggestion in this connection for your consideration. I think a Blue-Book should be published every year from each Province by some recognized Association giving the cases occurring in that Province, which point to the need for the speedy carrying out of this reform. We shall then have paved the way for the reform by the inexorable logic of facts which will carry home conviction to every unprejudiced mind. A Resolution of the House of Commons in favour of the reform would perhaps help the Government to introduce it. Of course, a large measure of discretion must be vested in the Government in the carrying out of the reform.

The question is really not one of expense but is more or less one of prestige. In the official mind—I should not like to say this of all officials—there are many officials who think differently, Mr. R. C. Dutt is himself an official—there seems to be an idea that to deprive the Chief Executive Officer of the District of his judicial powers would be to deprive him of his prestige and lower him in

the estimation of the public. But surely prestige that is bound up with a system which in theory is indefensible, and which in practice leads to injustice, is a very poor sort of prestige indeed, and must defeat its own object. Prestige which perpetuates injustice and excites discontent and dissatisfaction among the masses, for they are the chief sufferers by this injustice, is not worth having. It is no aid to the Government. It is a source of weakness and embarrassment. The old Scriptural text is true now as it was in the primitive days when it fell from prophetic lips—"Righteousness exalteth a nation." No Government can afford, under any pretext whatsoever—call it prestige, call it policy, call it by what name you like—to do aught or to suffer aught which may lead to defeat the ends of justice as between man and man which all Governments are commissioned by a writ from on High to maintain and promote.

Again I admit that Governments are bound to proceed with caution. I would find fault with a Government that was not cautious, reasonably cautious, against which the charge of recklessness could be brought in any form or shape whether in regard to the people's money or the people's happiness or convenience ; but the Government may in this connection begin the experiment in selected districts and await the result. I am afraid there may be parts of the country so disturbed that an experiment of this kind may not be desirable in the public interests. But, having admitted that the proposal embodies a counsel of perfection, public opinion has a legitimate right to ask Government to move on, and to give effect to it in a cautious and tentative spirit. It will not do in these days to recognize the perfection of a principle in the abstract and then refuse to give effect to it in practice. The present position of absolute inaction on the part of the Government in this matter is untenable. Let a great Government like ours yield before the importunate clamour of public opinion has assumed proportions, where a concession made will have the appearance of having been wrung under compulsion. Let not the words "too late "

be written upon the policy of Government in this or in other matters.

CRIMINAL CASES BETWEEN EUROPEANS AND INDIANS.

In this connection I cannot help referring to the deplorable instances of failure of justice in many criminal cases where Europeans are the accused and natives of India are the aggrieved party. It is a difficult and delicate matter to deal with; but we have a right to appeal for help to all right-minded Englishmen interested in upholding the fair fame of British justice. The Court of Directors in a despatch that is well known observed that it was not only necessary that justice should be done in India, but that the people should be convinced that justice has been done. Sir James Fitz-Stephen, a disciple of Carlyle, a worshipper of the doctrine of might as against right, of the doctrine of force as against the principle of moral persuasion in the government of communities, declared from his place in the Supreme Legislative Council that a single act of injustice done or believed to be done was more disastrous to British rule than a great reverse on an Asiatic battle-field. It is because we know that this class of cases is creating a great deal of dissatisfaction and discontent among the masses and is weakening the hold of the Government upon them, that we feel it our duty to call prominent attention to that matter. A writer in the columns of *India* suggests a modification of the law which is worth considering. He says:

I believe that in cases like the above the Court ought to be a mixed Court, *i.e.*, one of the Judges ought to be a Native and the other a European; and that the Jury should be half European and half Native. This is the only practical means by which a great scandal in our administration of justice can be removed and a serious political danger obviated.

THE LEGAL PRACTITIONERS BILL AND JURY BILL

Two Bills are now before the Supreme Legislative Council which will demand your earnest attention—the Legal Practitioners Bill and the Jury Bill. There is a feeling in some quarters that a wave of reaction has set in

and is unsettling the minds of our rulers. We all recognise the fact that human progress is largely made up of action and reaction; that the cause of reform never moves forward in straight line, but that it swings backward and forward like the pendulum of a clock; and that the forward movement more than makes up for the rebound. However that may be, both these Bills have filled the public mind with alarm, which, in the case of the Jury Bill, has partly been removed by the re-assuring message which His Excellency the Viceroy was able to give to the Poona Sarvejanik Sabha in reply to their address. The object of the Legal Practitioners Bill is to suppress law-touts. With that everybody will sympathise. But those who object to the Bill say, and I think with great force, that the Bill is calculated to suppress Mofussil pleaders rather than law-touts. Certain it is that the Bill proposes some very serious innovations. It proposes to arm the District Judge and the Commissioner of the Division with the power of removing a pleader, and the Commissioner of the Division with the power of removing a Revenue Agent. Under the Legal Practitioners Act of 1879, this power belongs exclusively to the High Court. It is a power which, with the exception of a brief intermission of a few years, has always been vested in the High Court. The District Courts can only make recommendations in this behalf. A power like this vested in the District Courts would, it was strongly urged at the Calcutta Meeting, deal a heavy blow at the independence of the Mofussil Bar. Pleaders will practice with a halter round their necks. They dare not hurt the susceptibilities of the District *Hakims*. They dare not show excess of zeal in any case in which local official opinion may have been elicited against their client. The client will suffer. The public will suffer. Undoubtedly the dismissed pleader will have the right to appeal to the High Court. But it is one thing to contest an open recommendation, and quite a different thing to seek to upset a final verdict. I may here remark that Her Majesty's Judges of the Superior Courts in England have not the power of disbarring a barrister practising before such

Courts. It is only the Benchers of the Inn of Court to which a barrister happens to belong who can disbar him. When Her Majesty's Judges in England cannot dismiss practitioners who appear before them, surely such a power should not be vested in our Mofussil Judges.

The question is not one that merely concerns lawyers. It has an important public bearing. The public are quite as interested as the lawyers. The independence of the Mofussil Bar is a matter of public concern. To imperil their independence is to aim a blow at the beginnings of national life, and to sap the springs of constitutional agitation in the Mofussil. The Bar constitutes the pillar of our public movements. Our Mofussil pleaders are the life and soul of our Municipalities and our District Boards. They are the secretaries and working members of our religious and social institutions. There is no movement in the Mofussil which does not owe its origin to them, or is not mainly guided by them. With such a law as this, they dare not take part in public movements, especially of a political character which might expose them to the displeasure of the local officials. It would be a public misfortune, it would throw back the cause of reform, if a law were passed which would interfere with the independence of such a useful body of men.

THE JURY NOTIFICATION

The Jury Notification was issued as you know in 1892. A Commission was appointed in 1893 to report upon the matter. The Notification, as you are aware, was subsequently withdrawn. The object of the present Bill is, as defined in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, to give effect to such of the recommendations of the Jury Commission as have been approved of by the Government of India and Her Majesty's Secretary of State. The most important provision of the Bill is that which refers to the amendment of Section 303 of the Criminal Procedure Code, empowering Judges to require Juries to bring in special verdicts. But this is precisely the provision of the Bill,

which is in entire conflict with the recommendations of the Jury Commission. This question of special verdicts was considered by them, and was unanimously rejected. And who were the members of the Jury Commission? The president was a Judge of the Calcutta High Court. Among the members were Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, late Officiating Chief Justice of Bengal; Mr. Wilkins, the present Legal Ramembrancer; and last but not least, Sir Griffith Evans, the present Officiating Advocate-General, in whom the Government has such great confidence that ever since 1878, the Government has continued appointing him as a Member of the Supreme Legislative Council. Apart from the weight which must belong to the opinion of such a body of men, we find the views of the Jury Commission in this respect are supported by high authority. The High Court of Calcutta describes the proposed amendment as "a radical and dangerous change in the law". The majority of the Judges of the Bombay High Court do not consider the amendment as called for, and the Government of Bengal, which issued the Jury Notification in 1802, accords to it only a qualified measure of support.

"After full consideration," says the letter of the Bengal Government, "the Lieutenant-Governor is disposed to agree with the Commission (the Jury Commission) that there is no absolute necessity for a change, as under the present law a Judge can, and a good Judge does, put the issue before the Jury, so that they should be obliged to give a verdict on each point, but since all Judges do not, Sir Charles Elliott would prefer to see such a change made in the wording of Section 803 as shall show that the procedure should always be as above described, the Judge laying down each issue and calling on the Jury for a special verdict on each."

The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal is of opinion that "there is no absolute necessity for this change in the law", if a good Judge could always be found to preside at a Sessions Trial in a Jury District. The Judicial Bench of the Civil Service in Bengal is surely not so wanting in capable men that it would be difficult to find good Judges for the

few Districts where Trial by Jury prevails. It seems to me that it would be very unwise to enact a law which is likely to create a great deal of public dissatisfaction, when the evil complained of, if it is real, might be remedied by administrative arrangements, unattended with any expense or inconvenience.

The Hon'ble Member in charge of the Bill in commenting upon this provision, remarked that it was liable to be attended with abuse. It seems, however, that there is no real cause for alarm, so far as this particular section of the Bill is concerned. We have the assurance of His Excellency the Viceroy that the effective, but at the same time the conservative, administration of the law would be secured and in a form that would recommend itself to the approval of public opinion. The Poona Sarvajanik Sabha is to be congratulated upon having obtained this expression of opinion from His Excellency. I will quote the words of His Excellency in this place :

I do not think it would be proper for me to enter into any discussion of the details of a Bill now before the Legislative Council, but I may say a word or two as to procedure. I cannot help thinking that a wholly disproportionate excitement has been got up over this matter. I gather that you, at all events, assent unreservedly to the recommendations of the Jury Commission, and acknowledge, therefore, that reforms are desirable in the law. On one point there is admittedly great difference of opinion. If the Government had ignored that point and left it out of the Bill, this difference of opinion, and all the consequences that result from difference of opinion would have remained. The Government thought it better that this point should be carefully and deliberately considered, and it will be carefully and deliberately considered in the proceedings of the Legislative Council. As the Hon'ble Member who introduced the Bill stated at the time, that is the object with which the Government have introduced this particular provision, and I venture to hope that by the co-operation of all who take an interest in the due, the effective, but still in the conservative administration of the law, the result of the discussions in

Calcutta will be that the law will be put into a shape which will meet the approval of your Sabha as well as the rest of the community.

I think I express the sense of this Congress when I say that we are all deeply grateful to His Excellency for this reassuring message. The provision of the Bill, in regard to the appointment of special jurors is, I think, a distinct improvement.

The system of Trial by Jury in the form in which it exists is undoubtedly English in its character. But the principle which underlies it is the principle of the *Panchayat* system, which in this country is as old as the hills, and is graven deep on the instincts of the people. I think it will be admitted on all hands, that on the whole the experiment has been a success and therefore we are justified in calling for an extension of the system, for which, indeed, we have repeatedly prayed, and which, we find, is supported by the high authority of Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, one of the members of the Jury Commission. I am glad to learn that the Government of Bengal has recommended the extension of the system to six new districts. That Government is to be congratulated on this decision.

EXCISE AND EDUCATION

There are other important questions included in your programme. If I had time I should have liked to have dwelt upon them. I should have specially liked to have referred to the question of Excise and the question of Education. We must press for local option. The Government has no right to thrust liquor shops upon unwilling communities. We must safeguard the interest of Education—primary, technical, and high. I am bound to say that the Government expenditure on Education is small when compared with similar expenditure incurred in other countries, and it is inadequate to the growing requirements of a progressive community like ours. It is my contention that in India, the expenditure per head of the population is the lowest as compared with British possessions in other parts of the world—in Asia, America, Africa,

and the Australian Continent. Here is a table which I have drawn up and which bears out this view of the matter:—

COUNTRIES.	POPULATION.	STATE EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION.	COST PER HEAD.
Great Britain and Ireland ...	37,879,285	£7,569,066	s. d. 3 11 $\frac{3}{4}$
Belgium ...	6,069,321	£876,297	2 2 $\frac{3}{4}$
France ...	38,343,192	£2,761,723	1 5 $\frac{3}{4}$
Russia ...	115,226,542	£3,820,496 $\frac{1}{4}$ s.	0 31 $\frac{1}{2}$
United States ...	62,622,250	£32,528,328	10 4 $\frac{2}{3}$
S. African Republic...	119,128	£13,823	7 4 $\frac{3}{4}$
New South Wales ...	1,132,234	£693,652	12 8
New Zealand ...	626,658	£411,922	13 15 $\frac{8}{9}$
Queensland ...	393,718	£253,758	12 10 $\frac{2}{3}$
Tasmania ...	146,667	£44,864	6 11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Victoria ...	1,140,405	£739,784	12 11 $\frac{2}{3}$
Western Australia ...	49,782	£10,397	4 21 $\frac{1}{4}$
Cape Colony ...	1,527,224	£147,424	1 111 $\frac{1}{6}$
Natal ...	543,913	£34,188	1 315
British Guiana ...	288,328	£18,116	1 3-1/13
Jamaica ...	648,558	£30,786	0 11-2/5
Mauritius ...	71,655	Rs. 45,352	As. 10 Ps. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ceylon ...	3,008,466	Rs. 508,116	" 2 1 $\frac{1}{2}$
India ...	221,172,958	Rs. 8,211,820	" 0 7-1/7
Bengal ...	70,000,000	Rs. 2,646,000	" 0 7-1/4

Thus it will be seen that while the expenditure on education per head of the population in Ceylon is over 2 Ans., in Mauritius, it is 10 Ans., in Natal, is. 3d., in British Guiana, it is 1s. 11d., and even in Russia it is 31 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., in India it is only a little over 7 Pies. Comment on these figures is unnecessary. I cannot say whether these figures include contributions made by local bodies. Even if such contributions were to be added, it would not, I think, make an appreciable difference.

We are indebted to Professor Oxenham for his defence of High Education. We are not in favour of High Education *vs.* Primary Education. We are in favour of all Education, high and low. They act and react upon each

other. They are part and parcel of a common and indissoluble system. High education does not benefit the recipients alone. It benefits the whole community; for if John Stuart Mill is to be accepted as our authority in these matters, the ideas of the educated classes filter downwards and become the ideas of the masses.

TOO MANY QUESTIONS BEFORE THE CONGRESS

It has, indeed, been said that we should not take up too many questions, that we should content ourselves with a few, and press them upon the attention of Government. There is considerable force in this observation. By covering a wider ground, we lose in concentration, and we run the risk of losing in effect. The more important questions are apt to be lost sight of in the consideration of the less important ones. From the point of view of presentation to Government, this is a disadvantage! But the Congress being national, its interests embracing the whole field of national concerns, it is difficult to curtail our programme, without leaving untouched a large number of questions which affect important interests. I think, however, we may adopt a middle course. I think we should give special prominence to a few questions only, such as Indian Finance, including the Home Charges and Military Expenditure, the separation of Judicial and Executive functions, the question of Simultaneous Examinations, the still further reform of the Legislative Councils and one or two other matters which might be mentioned.

CONGRESS WORK IN ENGLAND

From the consideration of our work here we may pass on to discuss our work in England. Our voice would be that of one crying in the wilderness but for our organization in London, the British Committee, our paper *India*, and our Parliamentary Committee. The money that we spend in England is worth its weight in gold. (*Hear, hear.*) It fructifies abundantly in the increasing interest which is being created in England in regard to Indian affairs. It is preparing the way for an abundant harvest of good in

which, under the Providence of God, our children and our children's children are destined to share. But how shall we fittingly describe the services of those good men and true, with Sir William Wedderburn at their head, who ungrudgingly devote their time and attention, often at considerably personal sacrifice, to work for us on the British Committee and the Parliamentary Committee! They say the word "gratitude" does not occur in our language. But the sentiment is there, deep-rooted in the hearts of our people; and in your name I desire to express our sense of profound gratitude to the members of the British Committee, and of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, for their disinterested services to India.

Never was there greater need than now for vigilance both here and in England. At the recent General Elections, our Parliamentary friends sustained a defeat all along the line, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. Herbert Paul, Mr. W. S. Caine (*cheers*) and other friends of Indian reform have all lost their seats, though we hope constituencies will soon be found for them which will return them to Parliament. My distinguished friend, Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, fought in the Liberal interest as bravely as man ever fought (*loud cheers*), but he too was defeated. Mr. Bhownaggee has been returned to Parliament in the Conservative interests. I hope and trust Mr. Bhownaggee will find time to read our programme and our proceedings; and if he does so, I am sure he will find that we are as warmly interested as we could be in the maintenance of Imperial unity, and that we are advocates of reform and not of revolution, and of reform as a safeguard against revolution. He must know that reforms indefinitely postponed lead to violent changes—that reforms quietly, steadily, cautiously introduced, so that the new adapts itself to the old and the old becomes a part of the new, add to the stability and strength of Governments. I hope that as the result of his studies, he will see his way to sympathize with our programme. His conservatism in English politics need not stand in the way of his adoption of the very moderate programme of the

Congress. Sir Richard Garth is a Conservative in politics. He is not able to accept the whole of our programme—he is not in favour of Simultaneous Examinations; but there is no stauncher friend of the Congress movement, whether among Liberals or Conservatives, and we Congressmen are deeply beholden to him for his defence of our cause, when it was assailed by the late Sir George Chesney.

FRIENDS OF INDIA ON THE LIBERAL SIDE

We have endeavoured so far to steer clear of party politics. But the bulk of our friends belong to the Liberal side. With the exception of Mr. Pincott and Sir Richard Garth, I cannot at this moment think of any Conservative politician who sympathises with the Congress movement. From the Liberal ranks we have received the largest measure of sympathy. When the delegates went to England in 1890, it was the Liberal Associations which organized their meetings in the Provincial centres. When the Liberals came into power, their sympathy with our popular aspirations was marked. It was a Liberal Parliament that recorded the Resolution in favour of Simultaneous Examinations, though I regret to say that it was a Liberal Secretary of State who nullified that Resolution. It was a Liberal Government that practically ordered the withdrawal of the Jury Notification. It was the mandate of a Liberal Secretary of State, Lord Kimberley, that saved in Bengal the system of Local Self-Government menaced by the Municipal Bill of 1892. It was a Liberal Government, too, that re-imposed the import duties on cotton goods in the interests of India.

INDIAN QUESTIONS AS PARTY QUESTIONS IN ENGLAND

Speaking for myself, I will say this, that until Indian questions are taken up as party questions, until they become factors in determining the issues of party contests, they cannot occupy a prominent place in English politics or engage a large measure of public attention in England. Before the English people can be expected to do justice to India, they must feel an interest in Indian topics, and they will not, and cannot, feel any interest in them, so

long as Indian questions remain outside the pale of party politics. We have it on the authority of John Morley that "Indian affairs entered materially into the great battle of parties" in the last century, and the impeachment of Warren Hastings, which for its moral results was a great and far-reaching event, was mainly prompted by party considerations.

INDIA'S LOYALTY TO THE BRITISH THRONE

What is our attitude with regard to the Government? I decline to discuss the charge of disloyalty which used to be brought against us in the early days of the Congress movement. Having regard to the official recognition which was extended to us by Lord Lansdowne's Government, this is no longer a question of practical politics. Are we then Her Majesty's constitutional Opposition in this country? I hardly think so. Our position is not analogous to that of a Parliamentary Opposition. A Parliamentary Opposition is bound to oppose all measures of the Government. It is its duty to oppose. It opposes for the mere sake of opposition. Its opposition is actuated by considerations of party spirit, under the influence of which the motives and the policy of the Government are liable to be needlessly aspersed. Our position is different. We are not bound to oppose the measures of Government. We are not expected to do so. Our countrymen would have a ground of complaint against us, if we did so, without sufficient cause. We do not oppose for the mere sake of opposition, and with a view to embarrass the Government, so that we may step into its place when the position is no longer tenable. We oppose bad measures. We support good measures. We may oppose the policy of the Government, but we impute no motives. Above all, our opposition is not dictated by any considerations of party spirit, but by the sole and single-minded desire to serve our countrymen and to broaden and deepen the foundations of British rule upon the unchangeable basis of a nation's affections.

We should suffer a distinct loss of power were we to constitute ourselves into permanent opposition to the

Government. If we oppose with discrimination and judgment, our protests will not fail to command sympathy and respect. But if we oppose in the spirit of captious fault-finding, if we oppose for the mere sake of opposition, if we oppose simply because somebody must oppose, we expose ourselves to the risk of being considered hostile critics, even when our representations deserve a better fate.

THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

To-day is the first day of the Eleventh Session of the Congress. Many Sessions of the Congress must yet be held before even our moderate programme is accomplished. The car of human progress moves slowly forward. But he who has set his hand to the plough cannot afford to look back. He must spend and be spent in the cause. How many brave comrades, whose memories we mourn, have fallen; how many more will yet fall before the journey through the wilderness is accomplished, and we are in view of Canaan. To some choice spirits, elevated by faith and hope, may be vouchsafed, as was vouchsafed to Moses of old from the heights of Sinai, a glimpse into the promised land, a foretaste of that precious treasure of civil and political rights which, in the Providence of God and under the auspices of English rule, is to be the destined heritage of their nation. As for the rest they must possess their souls in patience, supported by the undying faith that their cause, based upon the highest justice, must eventually triumph. 'A man with a conviction,' says John Stuart Mill in his *Essay on Representative Government*, 'is equal to ninety-nine without one.' The man of earnest faith is irresistible and all-conquering. We Congressmen know what we are about; we know our minds, we know our methods; we stick to them with resolute tenacity of purpose—with a faith which, so far as some of us are concerned, I will say, does not belong to the things of this world. And who will say that the future is not ours?

FAITH IN BRITISH JUSTICE AND GENEROSITY

We feel that in this great struggle in which we are engaged, the moral sympathies of civilised humanity are

with us. The prayers of the good and the true in all parts of the world follow us. They will welcome as glad tidings of great joy the birth of an emancipated people on the banks of the Ganges. For, have they not all read about our ancient civilization; how, in the morning of the world, before the Eternal City had been built upon the Seven Hills, before Alexander had marched his army to the banks of the Tigris, before Babylonian astronomers had learnt to gaze upon the starry world, our ancestors had developed a great civilization, and how that civilization has profoundly influenced the course of modern thought in the highest concerns of man? Above all, we rely with unbounded confidence on the justice and generosity of the British people and of their representatives in Parliament.

CONGRESS ACHIEVEMENTS

It is not that we mistrust the authorities here. But the higher we mount, the purer is the atmosphere. The impurities generated by local causes cannot touch those who, removed from local influences, represent in a loftier sphere of responsibility the majesty and the greatness of the English nation. Let us freely acknowledge the tribute we owe to the British Government in India. What Government could have accorded a speedier recognition to Congress claims than the Government of India has done? Within the lifetime of a generation we have achieved changes—beneficent changes of far-reaching moment—which it would have taken many generations to accomplish elsewhere, which in less fortunately situated countries could not have been accomplished except, perhaps, after bloodshed and tumult. All this we freely acknowledge. For all this we are truly grateful. All this fills us with hope for the future.

TRUST IN ENGLAND

Nevertheless we feel that much yet remains to be done, and the impetus must come from England. To England we look for inspiration and guidance. To England we look for sympathy in the struggle. From England must come the crowning mandate which will enfranchise.

our peoples. England is our political guide and our moral preceptor in the exalted sphere of political duty. English history has taught us those principles of freedom which we cherish with our life-blood. We have been fed upon the strong food of English constitutional freedom. We have been taught to admire the eloquence and genius of the great masters of English political philosophy. We have been brought face to face with the struggles and the triumphs of the English people in their stately march towards constitutional freedom. Where will you find better models of courage, devotion, and sacrifice; not in Rome, not in Greece, not even in France in the stormy days of the Revolution—courage tempered by caution, enthusiasm leavened by sobriety, partisanship softened by a large-hearted charity—all subordinated to the one predominating sense of love of country and love of God.

LOVE OF LIBERTY

We should be unworthy of ourselves and of our preceptors—we should, indeed, be something less than human—if, with our souls stirred to their inmost depths, our warm Oriental sensibilities roused to an unwonted pitch of enthusiasm by the contemplation of these great ideals of public duty, we did not seek to transplant into our own country the spirit of those free institutions which have made England what she is. In the words of Lord Lansdowne, a wave of unrest is passing through this country. But it is not the unrest of discontent or disloyalty to the British Government—it is the unrest which is the first visible sign of the awakening of a new national life. It is the work of Englishmen—it is the noblest monument of their rule—it is the visible embodiment of the vast moral influence which they are exercising over the minds of the people of India. Never in the history of the world have the inheritors of an ancient civilization been so profoundly influenced by the influx of modern ideas. In this Congress from year to year we ask England to accomplish her glorious work. The course of civilization following the path of the sun has travelled from East to West. The West owes a heavy debt to the East. We

look forward to the day when that debt will be repaid, not only by the moral regeneration, but by the political enfranchisement of our people.

APPEAL TO ANLO-INDIANS

In our efforts for the improvement of our political status, we feel that we may appeal with confidence to the sympathies of the Anglo-Indian community. They are Englishmen. By instinct and by tradition they are the friends of freedom. In regard to many, their interests in the country are permanent. In regard to many more, in view of the falling exchange, they are looking forward to making India their permanent home. Burke's well known aphorism of the Anglo-Indians of his day being "birds of prey and passage" is well-nigh an extinct tradition. Our interests and their interests are identical. Their political status is not a whit removed from ours. If they have more influence in the Government, it is due to sufferance. They cannot claim it as a matter of right. Any extension of our political privileges would benefit them as well as ourselves. Difference there will always be between different sections of the same community, as there is in this country between zamindars and ryots; as there is in European countries between capitalists and labourers. But we are essentially members of the same community, in the sense that we have common rights and common grievances, and that it is our duty to stand shoulder to shoulder to remedy our grievances and to promote our rights. We are all interested in the development of our manufactures, and we all know what pressure is brought to bear upon the Government here—sometimes masked under the guise of philanthropy, sometimes less thinly veiled—to interfere with the growth of our manufacturing industries. Here, as in other matters, united we stand, divided we fall.

PERORATION

There is another agency—impalpable and invisible, noiselessly advancing onwards amid the din of our strifes towards the accomplishment of its own hidden purposes—which is helping us in this onward struggle. That

agency is time. Time is with us. Time, present and future, is our ally. "Truth," says the Latin proverb, "is the daughter of Time." We rely upon the beneficent forces of the Unseen Time. I know not whether there ever was a golden age in the past. It is a beautiful tradition. It embalms the ever-present sense of dissatisfaction which humanity feels with the present. Dissatisfaction is the parent of all progress. It stirs us on to ceaseless activity for the betterment of our race. A golden age is, indeed, looming in the future. There is a golden age in store for us and our children. It is this feeling which reconciles us to the present. We feel that if political freedom, in the sense in which it is enjoyed by British subjects elsewhere, is not to be our lot, it will be the inheritance of those who, coming after us, will bear our names and carry on our work. In that faith we work. In that faith we ask others to work. It is the faith which is the cement of the Congress movement. It implies confidence in the progressive character of British rule. It implies confidence in ourselves. Let it not be said that this confidence is misplaced. Let it not be said that the enthusiasm which animated us in the first days of the Congress movement is on the wane. The past ought to encourage us. The future ought to stir us into enthusiasm. The noblest heritage which we can leave to our children and our children's children is the heritage of enlarged rights, safeguarded by the loyal devotion and the fervent enthusiasm of an emancipated people. Let us so work with confidence in each other, with unwavering loyalty to the British connection, that we may accomplish this great object within a measurable distance of time. Then will the Congress have fulfilled its mission—justified the hopes of those who founded it, and who worked for it—not, indeed, by the supersession of British rule in India, but by broadening its basis, liberalizing its spirit, ennobling its character, and placing it upon the unchangeable foundations of a nation's affections. It is not severance that we look forward to—but unification, permanent embodiment as an integral part of that great Empire which has given the rest of the world the models of free

institutions—that is what we aim at. But permanence means assimilation, incorporation, equal rights, equal privileges. Permanence is incompatible with any form of military despotism, which is a temporary makeshift adapted to a temporary purpose. England is the august mother of free nations. She has covered the world with free States. Places, hitherto the chosen abode of barbarism, are now the home of freedom. Wherever floats the flag of England, there free Governments have been established. We appeal to England gradually to change the character of her rule in India, to liberalise it, to shift its foundations, to adapt it to the newly developed environments of the country and the people, so that, in the fullness of time, India may find its place in the great confederacy of free States, English in their origin, English in their character, English in their institutions, rejoicing in their permanent and indissoluble union with England, a glory to the mother-country, and an honour to the human race. Then will England have fulfilled her great mission in the East, accomplished her high destiny among nations, repaid the long standing debt which the West owes to the East, and covered herself with imperishable renown and everlasting glory. (*Loud and long continued cheers.*)

Twelfth Congress—Calcutta—1896

HON. MR. R. M. SAYANI

INTRODUCTION

I beg to thank you most heartily for the great honour you have conferred upon me by electing me President of this your Twelfth Congress. It is the highest honor which my fellow-countrymen can bestow upon me. I am aware that it is also an honor which carries with it a serious responsibility, as it is by no means a light task to guide the deliberations of so large, so varied and so distinguished an assembly, representing as it does all that is loyal and patriotic, enlightened and influential, progressive and disinterested, in the country. I am further conscious of the fact that the position to which you have elected me has been invariably occupied in the past by extremely able leaders enjoying the full confidence of the people at large, and that under any circumstances, it will be beyond my power to come up to the standard of my immediate predecessor in this chair, who is so well known as one of the brightest ornaments of the country generally and especially of the province of Bengal. Relying, however, upon merciful Providence and on your indulgence and forbearance as also on your sympathy and support, I hope I may be able to discharge the duty you have entrusted me with to your satisfaction.

ORIGIN OF THE CONGRESS

Some time prior to the Christian year, 1885, certain Indian gentlemen who had received their education in the English language and been trained to English methods, and who had moreover derived their ideals of political institutions from English philosophers and statesmen, met

together to deliberate amongst themselves on the advisability of convening a meeting of some of the most enlightened men of each province for the purpose of discussing the moral and material condition of the country and taking practical steps for its amelioration. A meeting was accordingly resolved upon; and as its conveners were God-fearing, law-abiding, peace-loving and peaceful subjects, distinguished for their independence, for the purity of their public lives, for the honesty of their purpose and for their political sagacity, their invitation was largely and cordially responded to. The meeting was attended by delegates deputed from each province and by some Europeans who warmly sympathised with the object. The discussion unmistakably emphasised the fact that there was a general consensus of opinion amongst the educated Indians that the existing political condition of the country was susceptible of a vast improvement. Then there was no doubt that the people had well-founded grievances which required to be redressed and serious disabilities which needed removal. All were agreed that, in order to achieve those objects, so conducive to the greater happiness and contentment of the people, it was advisable to adopt all legitimate and constitutional means and proceed on the methods employed by Englishmen themselves for agitation; that if agitation was carried on, on such principles, never mind however long, there was a fair and reasonable chance of success, especially with the co-operation of such Europeans as were ready and willing to extend their sympathy and moral support to a movement so legitimate and national. It was accordingly decided that a Congress should be held of all educated and eminent Indians, leaders of various centres, and all admirers of the political institutions of England, with the express purpose of appealing to Government to redress grievances and remove disabilities from which the people suffered, and to secure such other reforms as the exigencies of the time and the progress of the country demanded, consistently of course with the liberal principles and the declared policy of the British Government as laid down years ago in statutes and charters, in Royal proclamations and resolutions,

of Parliament. Accordingly the necessary steps for organizing such a Congress were taken. The principal promoters of that organisation were themselves the products of English education, while the persons invited to attend from the different Presidencies were similarly the products of that same vivifying agency. There was also the facility of travel on account of the rapidity and cheapness of communication, the result of railways, one of the most important boons which English civilization conferred on our country. There was also the security to person and property assured by the Pax Britannica. Thus the call to attend fell upon willing ears and the invitees readily complied. All the elements necessary to secure a full attendance were combined, leading to cordial co-operation in the noble work thus initiated. In short, the country was ripe for the movement, so that delegates from the principal centres eagerly flocked to give expression to the "sober second thoughts of the people". They were all responsible citizens assembled to focus the manifold political grievances of the people and give them their needed articulation. For the first time they met on a common platform to achieve a common object, namely, to represent in the name of their countrymen the grievances under which they suffered and to give voice to their political sentiment and aspirations. They keenly felt the desire for wholesome reform and discussed with freedom and candour their political condition which they considered to be degrading. Their intellectual attainments recoiled against what they considered to be political subservience; their educated notions revolted against political disabilities; and their hearts aspired to attain a higher national ideal of citizenship under the beneficent rule of the British which they fully appreciated. It was an ideal worthy to be encouraged and fostered by all right-minded and justice-loving Englishmen, and took complete hold of them. The habitual lethargy of the Indian disappeared under the potent influence of this new and lofty standard of political regeneration. Ideas of a fair share in the management of the affairs of their own country and the enjoyment of greater constitutional freedom

pervaded all minds. It was not a mere sentimental cooing between loving cousins nor a mere stage-show got up for the amusement of the public at Christmas time, but a very serious organisation of combined intellectual strength, intended for the discussion of very serious matters. Surely they thought, and thought honestly, they were not mere theorists or sentimental dreamers, but intelligent, loyal, patriotic, well-meaning, public-spirited men, representing the collective wisdom and ability of what was soon to become a United India. Feelings of sympathy and brotherhood pervaded the members, and every one was prepared to give anxious thought and patient consideration to what each other had to advance and urge. They felt that the Congress was but the first rich harvest of what had been sown long before by wise and beneficent British statesmen in the shape of schools and colleges. They further felt that the Congress was but the visible embodiment of a new education and a new awakening such as the country had not seen for some centuries before—the strong impact of Western civilization of Eastern thought. In fact, they felt that there could be no doubt of the strength and depth of this awakening having national regeneration as its ultimate aim and object. They felt that their object was rational and practical—that under the vivifying influence of the Congress, all the various peoples of the country could slowly and steadily be welded into one inseparable, indissoluble whole, to the everlasting benefit of India and the glory of England, and that those who attended them as members of the first Congress would in the fullness of time be recognised as the great pioneers of the movement.

DECLARATIONS OF THE CONGRESS LEADERS

The following is a brief analysis of the declarations of the Congress leaders :—

(a) To remember that we are all children of our mother-country, India, and that as such we are bound to love and respect each other and have common fellow-feeling for each other, and that each one of us should regard as his own the interests of the rest of us.

(b) That we should endeavour to promote personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the great communities of India, to develop and consolidate sentiments of national growth and unity, to weld them together into one nationality, to effect a moral union amongst them, to remove the taunt that we are not a nation, but only a congeries of races and creeds which have no cohesion in them, and to bring about stronger and stronger friendly ties of common nationality.

(c) That we should endeavour specially to promote personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the earnest workers in the cause of India, to eradicate by direct friendly personal intercourse, all possible racial or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of India, and to develop and consolidate sentiments of national unity, to effect a moral union amongst them which may stand as a solid bulwark against all external elements likely to divide or separate.

(d) That we should work together for our common elevation; that we should work in the spirit that we are Indians and owe a duty to our country and to all our countrymen; that we should all work with a singleness of purpose for the amelioration of our country.

(e) That in carrying out our work, we should take care that no questions should be decided without full previous preparation and detailed discussion of it all over the country; that no point should be pressed unless there prevails an absolute or an almost absolute unanimity of opinion amongst the thinking and educated classes of our countrymen.

(f) That we should confine our attention to these questions only in which the entire nation has a direct participation; that we should pass only such resolutions as are not the issue of the brain of a single individual but are the result of the best thoughts of many minds during a long period; that we should give due deference to the views and feelings of each other amongst the whole people of our country; that we should deal with those questions alone on which the whole of the educated and thinking portion of British India is substantially agreed.

(g) That we should conduct our proceedings with moderation and dignity so as to disarm all adverse criticism; that every member should be afforded an opportunity of maturely and gravely considering each question in all its bearings; that we should conduct our proceedings in such a way that whenever any resolution or decision has been come to, it should proceed from the Congress with authority and be received outside with respect; that we should conduct our proceedings in such a way that we may acquire and maintain a character for moderation, sagacity, and practical good sense; that we should be moderate in our language, and in our demands; that we should remember that it is only by patience, perseverance, and long effort that we can hope to succeed.

(h) That we should remember that right and truth must ever prevail in the end; that it is not by violence or by noise that

great things are achieved, nor by ambition or self-seeking; that it is by calm, indomitable reliance on that moral force, which is the supreme reason, that a nation's life can be regenerated; that we should avoid taking jumps into the unknown.

(i) That the best interests of the Indian taxpayer lie in peace, economy and reform; that his motto should be peace, loyalty, and progress. That the first most essential requisite for his happiness is the assurance of permanent peace and the rigid maintenance of law and order.

(j) That our business is to represent to Government our reasonable grievances and our political disabilities and aspirations.

The following is a brief summary of the subjects discussed by the various Congresses held up to date:—

Working of Indian Administration, The Council of the Secretary of State for India, Legislative Councils, Simultaneous Examinations, Annexation of Upper Burma, Poverty of India, Public Service, Trial by Jury, Separation of Executive and Judicial Functions, Volunteering, Education, Industrial Condition of India, Arms Act, Police Administration, Abkari, State Regulation of Vice, Permanent Settlement, Plate Duties, Salt Duty, Forest Laws, Currency, Military and Civil Expenditure, Medical Service, Compensation Allowance, Force Labour, Cotton Duty, Financial Condition of India, Recruitment of Higher Judicial Service, Freedom of the Press, Water Cess, South Africa, Legal Practitioners Bill, and Grievances of Railway Passengers.

The following are the places where the Congress has held its sittings:—

Bombay	(twice)
Calcutta	(twice)
Madras	(twice)
Allahabad	(twice)
Nagpur	(once)
Lahore	(once)
Poona	(once)

The following are the names of the gentlemen who have presided at Congress Meetings:—

Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee	(twice)
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji	(twice)
Mr. Budrudin Tyabjee	(once)
Mr. George Yule	(once)
Sir W. Wedderburn, <i>Bart.</i>	(once)
Mr. P. M. Mehta	(once)
Mr. P. Ananda Charlu	(once)
Mr. Alfred Webb	(once)
Mr. Surendranath Banerjee	(once)

GROWTH OF THE CONGRESS

From the brief outlines of the history of the origin of the Congress herein given, of the declarations of its leaders, of the subjects it has discussed, of the places in which it has held its sittings, and of the persons who have presided over its deliberations, it is clear that the Congress was the direct outcome of the noble policy of England in introducing English education in India, and diffusing knowledge over the length and breadth of this country by means of schools and colleges and thus awakening the rising young men of our country to a sense of the duties they owed to themselves, to their neighbours, and to their countrymen generally. That although most of these young men had not travelled to Europe nor even crossed the ocean that separates their country from the rest of the world, indeed some of them had hardly travelled in their own country, and a few of them had never left even the confines of the towns which had given them birth, all of them had by studying all that is best and ennobling in English literature and freely conversing with noble-minded Englishmen, acquired a knowledge of the events that had happened and were happening in Europe, and especially in England, that thrice happy Island, the home of liberty and progress. They had amongst other things learnt how the existing political institutions of England had obtained their present form; how English patriots, through adverse circumstances, had, by never-failing courage and indomitable perseverance, acquired one after another their present privileges of liberty of thought and freedom of action both in the field of religion and politics. We all know how in ancient times noble persons who resolved to devote their lives to the beautifying of their mother-cities, used to travel far and wide, and in their extensive travels used to come across the beauties of other cities, and from such beauties to form general notions of beauty, and how, on their return to their native cities, used to endeavour to beautify their own cities in accordance with the notions of beauty thus formed by them. In a similar manner our educated young men, whilst mentally travelling through the

realms of the History of Europe generally, and particularly the History of England, had their attention drawn to the political history of England, and thus acquired ideas of liberty, which, in course of time, they thought of applying to their own country. In short, they became anxious to regenerate the political condition of India. They felt, however, that the vast majority of their own countrymen, among whom higher education had not yet permeated, would at first give them no support but rather ridicule, and would obstruct them. At the same time they anticipated that the ruling class might misunderstand them. They felt they had serious difficulties to contend with in the initial stage. Misrepresentation and misunderstanding are elements which every new movement has to combat with. They resolved, therefore, to be cautious and circumspect, and at every step to feel the ground before they actually put their foot thereon. They were, of course, prepared to face adverse and hostile criticism, obloquy and accusations. The English martyrs, they knew, had undergone all this, nay, even suffered tortures and death. But our young men felt they had certain advantages which English martyrs had not. The Government had educated them, had in a manner sown the seeds of and fostered their new ideas. Some Englishmen themselves sympathised with them. Under the ægis of English rule they had toleration, and believing in their new faith and resolved to go through all trials, all struggles, all vicissitudes, they started to put their ideas into execution.

The origin of the Congress was thus an epoch in the history of the country, and with the establishment of the Congress began a new era in the political history of India, and during the years that have followed, the movement has extended from a comparatively few persons to the whole of the educated classes and has already begun to agitate the masses, and if it is guided in the future, as it has been guided in the past, by moderation, prudence, and sagacity, is bound to have a decisive influence on the destinies of British India for the good of the country and for the glory of England. The Congress is now favoured with

the presence of about two thousand members from as many hundred places, all speaking the "sober second thoughts" of the people and counting amongst them the foremost leaders of opinion in the country, and all the culture, the intelligence, and the public-spirit—indeed, the collective wisdom of the united, educated, and thinking portion of British India. It holds its sittings in the most important cities in the empire, under the presidency of the most prominent Indians of the day as well as of Englishmen of the genuine sympathy of the late Mr. George Yule, Sir William Wedderburn, and Mr. Alfred Webb.

CONGRESS PRESIDENTS

The first President of the Congress was an able representative of Bengal, Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, an able and experienced member of our legal profession (who is known to have more than once refused a High Court Judgeship) whose devotion to his country is well known.

The second President was my fellow-citizen, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, whose invaluable and disinterested services to his country for nearly half-a-century, not forgetting the work recently done in Parliament, are now matter of history. In fact, he may be said to be the principal maker of the political history of the country.

The third President was my honoured and distinguished co-religionist, Mr. Justice Budrudin Tyabji, an educated and cultured Mussalman of catholic views.

The fourth President was the late Mr. George Yule, a distinguished Anglo-Indian merchant, who had taken a deep interest in the welfare of the country and its people.

The fifth President was again an Anglo-Indian, a member of the Indian Civil Service, a distinguished champion of the Congress movement, Sir W. Wedderburn (Baronet) M.P., who has worked in and out of Parliament with a devotion which has commanded the admiration of all India.

The sixth President was my valued friend, Mr. P. M. Mehta, one of the most enthusiastic and devoted adherents

of the cause of India, whose record of services for the last thirty years is one of which every one of my countrymen ought to be proud.

The seventh President was Rai Bahadur P. Ananda Charlu, a distinguished representative from Madras, an eminent leader in his own Presidency.

The eighth President was again Mr. W. C. Bonnerji, of whom I have already spoken.

The ninth President was again Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the self-denying, unique patriot of India, whose advent to Lahore was the cause of those unparalleled demonstrations which are already historical.

The tenth President, Mr. Webb, was a warm-hearted and reflective Irish Member of Parliament in deep sympathy with our aspirations.

The eleventh President was the Hon. Surendranath Bannerji, whom I have already referred to. This brief record shows the cosmopolitan character of this great movement. It also indicates how representative it has been of all the communities of this great empire, Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsis and Anglo-Indians. Their addresses prove that the Congress is not a party organisation or a political caucus, but an assembly representative of the light and leading of this vast empire, dealing with public matters and serving public interests generally in a broad and catholic spirit, with the view not of supplanting, as is often erroneously and absurdly alleged, but of supporting the Government of this country.

CONGRESS, THE EURASIANS, THE PORTUGUESE, THE JEWS

The only communities that remain yet unhonoured in this matter are the Eurasians, the Portuguese, and the Jews. It is not, I presume, from any lack of desire on the part of this Congress that they have not yet been honoured with the election of one of them as President, but because the communities are small, and it is difficult to find from them representative men. In the case of the

Eurasians, this opportunity would have been gladly availed of had not the late Mr. D. S. White, the President of the Eurasian Association, been snatched away from us by the cruel hand of death, soon after the date of the first Congress held in Bombay, at which he was present. I hope, and this assembly will, I trust, share my hope, that these communities also will have their turn in proper time.

CONGRESS AND MAHOMEDANS

With a record of such illustrious Presidents before me, and coming, as I had to do immediately, after one of the most eloquent modern Indian orators and leading spirits of the wealthy and educated province of Bengal, I naturally felt diffident of my ability to discharge the onerous and responsible duties devolving upon the occupant of this chair, but counting, as I have already stated, upon your indulgence, forbearance, and generosity, your sympathy and support, I consented to preside, resolved to follow the example of my esteemed friend Mr. Justice Budrudin Tyabji, who has had the benefit of eight years' residence in England, is a gentleman of manifold experience, moderate and considerate views on public affairs, and who has been eminently successful but is nevertheless an orthodox Mussulman commanding the confidence and respect of his co-religionists. The one great object-lesson which his example teaches is, that Mussalmans, with benefit to themselves, and consistently with Mussulman interests—even assuming the Mussalman interests, as unthinkingly alleged, are in conflict with interests of the rest of the Indians—can and ought to take part in this national movement.

CONGRESS PROGRAMME

I now proceed to point out how far in unison with the declared policy of Great Britain and British statesmen is the programme of the Indian National Congress. From the following few extracts it will be seen that the Congress is doing nothing but nobly endeavouring to practically pursue the very policy which the statesmen, whose views I give in these extracts, laid down for the better

government of India during the best part of the present century.

SIR JOHN SHORE ON THE INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Sir John Shore, in 1787 :

Whatever allowance we may make for the increased industry of the subjects of the State, owing to the enhanced demand for the produce of it (supposing the demand to be enhanced), there is reason to conclude that the benefits are more than counterbalanced by evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion.

MR. CHARLES GRANT ON INDIAN CONDITIONS

Mr. Charles Grant, in 1792 :

Whatever diversity of opinion may have prevailed respecting the past conduct of the English in the East, all parties will concur in one sentiment that we ought to study the happiness of the vast body of subjects which we have acquired there. Upon this proposition taken as a truth of the highest sincerity and importance, the following observations are founded. Although in theory it never can have been denied that the welfare of our Asiatic subjects ought to be the object of our solicitude, yet, in practice, this acknowledged truth has been but slowly followed up. Of late undoubtedly much has been done, and excellently done, to improve the condition of our subjects in the East, yet, upon attentive examination, it may perhaps be found that much yet remains to be performed.

Amongst measures of improvement, Mr. Grant advocates that no force but reason should be employed, that knowledge should be communicated to the natives of India through the medium of the English language ; extension of printing for dissemination of English ideas ; enlightening Indians by promoting mechanical industry ; improvement in agriculture by introduction of machinery.

THE ACT OF 1813

The Act of 1813 :

That it is the duty of this country to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British Dominions in India, and such means ought to be adopted as may tend to the introduction among them of useful knowledge and of religious and moral improvement, and in furtherance of the above objects sufficient facilities ought to be afforded by law to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India for the purpose of accomplishing

the benevolent designs, so as the authority of the local Governments respecting the intercourse of the Europeans with the interior of the country be preserved, and the principles of the British Government on which the natives of India have hitherto relied for the free exercise of their religion be unavoidably maintained.

STATE AND EDUCATION

By clause 43 of this Act, it was ordered that the sum of £10,000 should be appropriated to the education of the natives in all the three Presidencies. This was the *first* statutory declaration enjoining on the East India Company to spend a lakh of rupees on education. The sum, however, was not spent till 1824, which is the first year in which the State spent some money on education.

LORD MOIRA'S VIEWS

On the 2nd October, 1815, Lord Moira issued a minute declaring his solicitude for the moral and intellectual condition of the natives, and his anxiety to see established and maintained some system of public education.

LORD HASTINGS'

In 1817, Lord Hastings announced that the Government in India did not consider it necessary to keep the natives in a state of ignorance in order to retain its own power; consequent on this announcement the Calcutta Text-book Society and the Hindu College were immediately founded.

ELPHINSTONE'S

Elphinstone, in 1823 :—

It is difficult to imagine an undertaking in which our duty, our interest and our honour are more immediately concerned. It is now well understood that in all countries the happiness of the poor depends in a great measure on their education. It is by means of it alone that they can acquire those habits of prudence and self-reliance from which all other good qualities spring, and if ever there was a country where such habits are required, it is this. We have all often heard of the ills of early marriages and over-flowing population, of the savings of a life squandered on some one occasion of festivity, of the helplessness of the ryots which renders them a prey to money-lenders, of their indifference to good clothes or houses which has been used on some occasions as an argument

against lowering the public demands on them, and finally, of the vanity of the laws to protect them when no individual can be found who had spirit enough to take advantage of those enacted in their favour; there is but one remedy for all this, which is education. If there be a wish to contribute to the abolition of the horrors of self-immolation and of infanticide, and ultimately to the destruction of superstition in India, it is scarcely necessary now to prove that the only means of success lies in the diffusion of knowledge.

SIR JOHN MALCOLM'S

Sir John Malcolm, in 1828 :—

One of the chief objects I expect from diffusing education among the natives of India, is our increased power of associating them in every part of the administration. This I deem essential on grounds of economy, of improvement, and of security. I further look to the employment of the natives in such duties of trust and responsibility as the only mode in which we can promote their improvement; and I must deem the instruction we are giving them dangerous, instead of useful, unless the road is opened wide to those who receive it to every prospect of honest ambition and honourable distinction.

VIEWS OF THE COURT OF DIRECTORS

The Court of Directors, in 1830 :

In the meantime we wish you to be fully assured, not only of our anxiety that the Judicial offices to which natives are at present eligible should be properly filled, but of our earnest wish and hope to see them qualified for situations of higher importance and trust. There is no point of view in which we look with greatest interest at the exertions you are now making for the instruction of the natives than as being calculated to raise up a class of persons qualified, by their intelligence and morality, for high employments in the Civil administration of India. As the means of bringing about this desirable object, we rely chiefly on their becoming, through a familiarity with European literature and science, imbued with the ideas and feelings of civilized Europe, on the general cultivation of their understandings, and specifically on their instruction in the principles of morals and general jurisprudence. We wish you to consider this as our deliberate view of the scope and end to which all our endeavours with respect to the education of the natives should refer. And the active spirit of benevolence, guided by judgment, which has hitherto characterized your exertions, assures us of our ready and zealous co-operation towards an end which we have so deeply at heart.

The improvements in education, however, which most effectually contribute to elevate the moral and intellectual

condition of a people, are those which concern the education of the higher classes, of the persons possessing leisure and important influence over the minds of their countrymen. By raising the standard of instruction among the classes you would eventually produce a much greater and more beneficial change in the ideas and feelings of the community than you can hope to produce by acting directly on the more numerous class.

You are, moreover, acquainted with our anxious desire to have at our disposal a body of natives qualified by their habits and acquirements to take a large share and occupy higher situations in the Civil administration of their country than has hitherto been the practice under our Indian Governments.

LORD MACAULAY ON INDIAN EDUCATION

Lord Macaulay, in 1831 :

It would be far better for us that the people of India were well-governed and independent of us than ill-governed and subject to us; that they were ruled by their own kings and wearing our broadcloth, and working with our cutlery, than that they were performing their *salaams* to English Collectors and English Magistrates, but were too ignorant to value, or too poor to buy, English manufactures. To trade with civilised men is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages. That would indeed be a doting wisdom which would keep a hundred millions of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be slaves.

MR. CHARLES GRANT IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. Charles Grant, in 1833:

Resolution moved by him in the House of Commons :

That it is expedient that the Government of the British possessions in India be entrusted to the said company under such conditions and regulations as Parliament shall enact, for the purpose of extending the commerce of this country and of securing the good government and promoting the religious and moral improvement of the people of India.

THE ACT OF 1833

The Act of 1833 :

That no native of the said territories (India) nor any natural-born subject of His Majesty resident therein shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, color, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office, or any employment under the said Government.

'That the policy of British Rule in India should be a policy of justice and advancement of the people. India was to be regarded as a Test placed by God in the hands of Englishmen, and they would follow the "plain path of duty".'

FREE PRESS

FREE PRESS, 1835: Free Press was conceded.

VIEWS OF EMINENT ENGLISHMEN ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

MR. GLADSTONE:

It will not do for us to treat with contempt or even with indifference the rising aspirations of this great people.

LORD ROBERTS:

Our greatest strength must ever rest on the firm base of a united and a contented India.

LORD NORTHBROOK, in 1874:

There is one simple test which we may apply to all Indian questions; let us never forget that it is our duty to govern India, not for our own profit and advantage, but for the benefit of the natives of India.

LORD LYTTON, in 1877:

But you the natives of India, whatever your race and whatever your creed, have a recognised claim to share largely with your English fellow-subjects, according to your capacity for the task, in the administration of the country you inhabit. This claim is founded on the highest justice. It has been repeatedly affirmed by British and Indian statesmen and by the legislation of the Imperial Parliament. It is recognised by the Government of India as binding on its honor and consistent with the aims of its policy.

LORD RIPON, in 1892:

The document (Her Majesty's Proclamation) is not a treaty, it is not a diplomatic instrument, it is a declaration of principles of Government, which, if it is obligatory at all, is obligatory in respect to all to whom it is addressed. The doctrine, therefore, to which Sir Fitz-James Stephen has given the sanction of his authority, I feel bound to repudiate to the utmost of my power. It seems to me to be inconsistent with the character of my Sovereign and with the honour of my country, and if it were free to be received and acted upon by the Government of England, it would do more harm than anything else could possibly do to strike at the very root of our

power and to destroy our just influence, because that power and that influence rest upon the conviction of our good faith more than upon any other foundation, aye, more than upon the valour of our soldiers and the reputation of our armies.

My study of History has led me to the conclusion that it is not by force of her armies or by the might of her soldiery that a great empire is permanently maintained, but it is by the righteousness of her laws, by her respect for the principles of her justice.

LORD DUFFERIN, in 1887:

Glad and happy should I be if, during my sojourn among them (the people of India), circumstances permitted me to extend and to place upon a wider and more logical footing the political status, which was so wisely given a generation ago by that great statesman Lord Halifax, to such Indian gentlemen as by their influence, by their acquirements and the confidence they inspired in their fellow-countrymen, were marked out as useful adjuncts to our Legislative Councils.

BRITISH POLICY IN INDIA

The principles of policy, which may be deduced from the above extracts, are:

(a) That it is the duty of England to study the interest, the happiness and the welfare of the people of India.

(b) That it was not necessary to keep the people of India in a stage of ignorance in order to retain the power of England over India.

(c) That the people of India should be educated. That this education should be given to them through the medium of the English language and that English ideas should be disseminated amongst them.

(d) That the people of India should be associated in the administration of the country and that every prospect of honest ambition and honourable distinction should be open to them.

(e) That all disabilities in regard to public employment should be removed.

(f) That the policy of British Rule in India should be a policy of justice, good faith and righteousness and of advancement of the people.

THE ROYAL PROCLAMATION OF 1858

I now pass on to the gracious Proclamation of the Queen in 1858—a Proclamation which is rightly held to be the Magna Charta of the Indian people. It will be

observed that it is to secure the fulfilment of the solemn pledges of the Proclamation that the Congress is strenuously endeavouring. It is because some of the pledges remain unfulfilled and others are violated that the Congress is obliged to appeal to our rulers. Let me now repeat some of the extracts :

We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects ; and those obligations by the blessings of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil.

And it is our further wish, that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be truly and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity to discharge.

This document is, as stated by Lord Ripon, a declaration of principles of Government. It is the Magna Charta of British India. It was not the result of agitation or even of petition. It was granted by the free will and pleasure of the Sovereign, and truly displays the generosity of the Royal nature. It was given after the suppression of the Mutiny, and is a remarkable proof of the clemency of the British Crown. It is characteristic of the Noble Lady, the Mother of her Subjects, whose reign has been an epoch in the history of the world. Deep reliance on merciful Providence and true sincerity pervade the document. It is stated that this century, which is rapidly approaching its end, has been the humanitarian century *par excellence*, and has seen the end of many injustices and of many follies, that deserved to be wiped off the face of creation. But of all the mementoes of this humanitarian century, so far as India is concerned, the Proclamation will stand the highest and will be cherished the deepest and the longest by a grateful people.

BRITISH SYMPATHY WITH INDIAN ASPIRATIONS

It will be observed from the above extracts, both from the opinions of the English statesmen and from the Proclamation, that the people of England, possessing, as they do, a genuine admiration for their own constitution, and jealous as they are for their own liberty, are not the people

to view with disfavour the political aspirations of the people of India, aspirations forsooth, which the people of England themselves have deliberately inspired in the hearts of the people of India by purposely educating them in the English language, by disseminating amongst them English ideals of political life, and by encouraging them to raise themselves by education, intelligence and integrity, so as to become qualified to occupy positions of importance and trust in the service of the Government, as also to take part in the administration of the country. Under the circumstances those persons—and I regret to say some such do exist amongst my community—who imagine that the people of England are at heart against the people of India, are certainly doing a great injustice to the people of England. It may be that such wrong-headed persons may have been led into committing the mistake by the insular rigidity of England and the stiff-and-stand-off attitude of some Englishmen and their rough refusal at times to budge or bend an inch. But surely such persons should not be carried away by outward appearances or by false inferences derived from such outward appearances. If such people will go a little deeper into things, their minds will soon be disabused of these pure delusions. In fact, a more honest or sturdy nation does not exist under the sun than this English nation; and there ought to be no doubt whatever as to the ultimate concession of our demands, founded, as such demands are, on reason and justice on the one hand, as on the declared policy and the plighted word of the people of England on the other—provided always that the people of India are true to themselves. I repeat that there can be no doubt whatever as to these reasonable demands being ultimately conceded. Sir William Wilson Hunter, in his article dealing with “the effects of a strongly constructed and vigorously enforced system of Western instruction upon an Asiatic population,” says.

“India is now going through a quicker and more striking metamorphosis. We sometimes hear its marvellous awakening compared to the renaissance of Europe four hundred years ago. But in India the change is not only taking place on a greater scale but it also goes deeper. It derives its motive power, moreover, not from the

individual impulse of isolated men of genius or of cultural popes and princes, but from the mighty centralising force of a Government which, as an engine of human unification, has had nothing to compare with it since the days of Imperial Rome. English Rule in India is however calmly carrying out processes of consolidation that never entered the brain of Roman Statesman or Emperor. While maintaining a policy of cold non-interference towards the rival religions, the domestic institutions, and the local usages of the Indian peoples, it is silently undermining those ancient separatist influences which made for the isolation of races. It has created a new nexus for the active intellectual elements in the population—a nexus which is beginning to be recognised as a bond between man and man and between province and province, apart from the ties of religion, of geographical proximity, or of caste, a nexus interwoven of three strong cords: a common language, common political aims, and a sense of the power of action in common, the products of a common system of education.

I may therefore briefly say that these political movements are the legitimate and inevitable results of Western education in India. The men who conduct them are the men to whom in all other respects, intellectual and moral, we are accustomed to point as the highest products of British Rule in India. They are the men who form the natural interpreters of our Rule to the masses of the people. To speak of such men, when their activity takes a political direction as disaffected, would be equally unjust and untrue; for they are the men who, of all our Indian fellow-subjects, realise most clearly that their interests, present and future, are identified with the permanence of British Rule.

But brief as this survey has unavoidably been, it suffices to show that the present political movements among the Indian races are only one aspect of a general advance: moral, intellectual, and industrial, that is now going on. The most significant fact connected with the late Indian National Congress at Bombay was not its marvellous assemblage of 1889 representatives from every Province of India. It was rather that this great gathering for political purposes was held side by side with a still greater meeting in the same city for ameliorating the condition of women in India, the Social Reform Conference, attended by 6,000 persons, chiefly Hindus. A political movement, which is purely political, may be wise or unwise; but a political movement which forms part of the general advance of a people to a higher state of society and to a nobler ideal of domestic and individual life is irresistible. It may be guided, it may be moderated, but it must assuredly be reckoned with.

SYED AHMED KHAN ON INDIAN AGITATION

At a meeting held on the 10th May 1866, at Aligarh, Syed Ahmed Khan, in a deliberate speech, said:—

It is with great regret that we view the indifference and want of knowledge evinced by the people of India with regard to the British Parliament. Can you expect that body, Gentlemen, to take a deep interest in your affairs if you do not lay your affairs before it? There are many men now composing it, liberal in their views, just and virtuous in their dealings, who take a deep interest in all that affects the welfare of the human race. To excite this interest, however, it is necessary that the requirements and wishes of that portion of mankind on whose behalf they are to exert themselves be made clearly known to them. Their interest and philanthropy once excited, you may feel assured, Gentlemen, that the wants, be the wants of the Jew, the Hindu, the Christian or the Mahomedan, of the black man or of the white, will be attentively studied and duly cared for. India, with that slowness to avail herself of that which would benefit her so characteristic of Eastern races, has hitherto looked on Parliament with a dreamy, apathetic eye, content to have her affairs, in the shape of her Budget, brought before it in an annual and generally inaudible speech by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India. Is this state of things to continue, or has the time now come when the interests of this great dependency are to be properly represented in the governing body of the British Nation? 'It has come, Gentlemen, and I entreat you to interest yourselves for your country. The European section of the community in India, now grown so large, have set on foot an association in London with branch associations in India, in order to have Indian affairs and the wants and desires of all classes of her inhabitants brought prominently to the notice of Parliament but unless the entire native community out here co-operate with them, place funds at their disposal, and take such measures as may conduce to place the scheme on a permanent basis, the opportunity will be lost, the natives of India will be unrepresented, and you will only have yourselves to reproach when in after-years you see the European section of the community enjoying their well-earned concessions, whilst your wants remain still unmet.

I am afraid that a feeling of fear that the Government or the district authorities would esteem you factious and discontented, were you to inaugurate a measure like this, deters you from coming forward for your country's good. Are the Europeans thought factious and discontented? Believe me, that this moral cowardice is wrong, this apprehension unfounded; and that there is not an Englishman of a liberal turn of mind in India who would regard with feelings other than those of pleasure and hope such a healthy sign of increased civilization on the part of its inhabitants. If you will only show yourselves possessed of zeal and self-reliance, you are far more likely to gain the esteem of an independent race like the English than if you remain, as you now are, apathetic and dependent. The actions and laws of every Government, even the wisest that ever existed, although done or enacted from the most

upright and patriotic motives, have at times proved inconsistent with the requirements of the people or opposed to real justice. The natives have at present little or no voice in the management of the affairs of their country, and should any measure of Government prove obnoxious to them, they brood over it, appearing outwardly satisfied and happy, whilst discontent is rankling in their minds. I hope you, my native hearers, will not be angry with me for speaking the truth. You know that you are in the habit of inveighing against various acts of Government in your own homes and amongst your own families, and that you, in the course of your visits to European gentlemen, represent yourselves as quite satisfied with the justice and wisdom of these very acts. Such a state of affairs is inimical to the well-being of the country. Far better would it be for India were her people to speak out openly and honestly their opinions as to the justice or otherwise of the acts of Government.

Syed Ahmed Khan then quotes from John Stuart Mill the following passage :—

The rights and interests of every or of any person are only secure from being disregarded when the person interested is himself able and habitually disposed to stand up for them. The second is that the general prosperity attains a greater height and is more widely diffused in proportion to the personal energies enlisted in promoting it.

Syed Ahmed Khan then proceeds :—

These principles, my friends, are as applicable to the people of India as they are to those of any other nation, and it is in your power, it now rests with you alone to put them into practice. If you will not help yourselves, you may be quite certain no one else will. Why should you be afraid? Here am I, a servant of Government speaking out plainly to you in this public meeting. My attachment to Government was proved, as many of you know, in the eventful year of the Mutiny. It is my firm conviction—one which I have invariably expressed, both in public and in private—that the greater the confidence of the people of India in the Government, the more solid the foundation upon which the present Government rests, and the more mutual friendship is cultivated between your rulers and yourselves, the greater will be the future benefit to your country. Be loyal in your hearts, place every reliance upon your rulers, speak out openly, honestly, and respectfully all your grievances, hopes and fears, and you may be quite sure that such a course of conduct will place you in the enjoyment of all your legitimate rights, and that this is compatible, nay, synonymous with true loyalty to the State, will be upheld by all whose opinion is worth hearing.

CONGRESS AND MUSSULMANS

It is imagined by some persons that all, or almost all, the Mussulmans of India, are against the Congress movement. That is not true. Indeed, by far the largest part do not know what the Congress movement is. Education of any sort or kind is conspicuous by its absence amongst them, and their habitual apathy has kept them from understanding the movement at all. In fact, they are blissfully ignorant. What the causes of such ignorance and apathy are, will be presently inquired into. It will be sufficient here to state that one infinitely small class of persons who have received liberal education through the medium of the English language, and another equally infinitely small class of persons who have received no education whatever through the medium of the English language, but who have acquired a smattering of what they are pleased to consider education through the Hindustani language, have considered it a fashionable thing to abuse the Congress and Congressmen as such. There being thus two different classes of malcontents, if they may be so called, the grounds of their opposition are naturally different, nay even inconsistent, with each other. There is a third class, also a small one at present, who have recently risen from their apathy and are honestly endeavouring to educate themselves in the right direction and are destined soon to come to the front, and it may safely be surmised, will become as enthusiastic supporters of the Congress movement as any; but with this last mentioned class we have no immediate concern, and this address will confine itself to the two classes first mentioned. Before going, however, through the grounds of opposition on the part of these two classes, it is desirable to revert to the causes of ignorance and apathy aforesaid. An advocate of the views of the first two classes might well be supposed, if he ever cared to put his views systematically, to place the case for the Mahomedans in the following way :—

Before the advent of the British in India, the Mussulmans were the rulers of the country. The

Mussulmans had, therefore, all the advantages appertaining to the ruling class. The sovereign and the chiefs were their co-religionists, and so were the great landlords and the great officials. The court language was their own. Every place of trust and responsibility, or carrying influence and high emoluments was by birthright theirs. The Hindu did occupy some position, but the Hindu holders of position were but the tenants-at-will of the Mussulmans. The Mussulmans had complete access to the sovereigns and to the chiefs. They could, and did, often eat at the same table with them. They could also, and often did, intermarry. The Hindus stood in awe of them. Enjoyment and influence and all the good things of the world were theirs. Into the best-regulated kingdoms, however, as into the best-regulated societies and families, misfortunes would intrude and misfortunes did intrude into this happy Mussulman Rule. By a stroke of misfortune, the Mussulmans had to abdicate their position and descend to the level of their Hindu fellow-countrymen. The Hindus who had before stood in awe of their Mussulman masters were thus raised a step by the fall of their said masters and with their former awe dropped their courtesy also. The Mussulmans who are a very sensitive race, naturally resented the treatment and would have nothing to do either with their rulers or with their fellow-subjects. Meanwhile the noble policy of the new rulers of the country introduced English education into the country. The learning of an entirely unknown foreign language, of course, required hard application and industry. The Hindus were accustomed to this, as even under the Mussulman Rule, they had practically to master a foreign tongue, and so easily took to the new education. But the Mussulmans had not yet become accustomed to this sort of thing, and were, moreover, not then in a mood to learn, much less to learn anything that required hard work and application, especially as they had to work harder than their former subjects, the Hindus. Moreover, they resented competing with the Hindus, whom they had till recently regarded as their inferiors. The result was that so far as education was concerned, the Mussulmans who were once

superior to the Hindus now actually became their inferiors. Of course, they grumbled and groaned, but the irony of fate was inexorable. The stern realities of life were stranger than fiction. The Mussulmans were gradually ousted from their lands, their offices; in fact, everything was lost save their honor. The Hindus, from a subservient state, came into the lands, offices and other worldly advantages of their former masters. Their exultation knew no bounds, and they trod upon the heels of their former masters. The Mussulmans would have nothing to do with anything in which they might have to come into contact with the Hindus. They were soon reduced to a state of utter poverty. Ignorance and apathy seized hold of them while the fall of their former greatness rankled in their hearts. This represents the train of thought which pre-occupies the mind of many who would otherwise be well disposed towards this movement; all will admit that though they might object to particular statements, on the whole there is an element of truth which explains the Mahomedan depression.

SIR W. W. HUNTER ON EARLY MAHOMEDAN INFLUENCE

Sir W. W. Hunter says :—

Almost everywhere it was found that the Hindu population seized with avidity on the opportunities afforded by State education or bettering themselves in life; while the Mahomedan community, excepting in certain localities, failed as a whole to do so. State education thus put the finishing stroke to the influence of the Mahomedans, as the former ruling race in India. That position they had inherited from the time of the Mogul Empire, and during the first period of the Company's administration they still held an unique proportion of official posts. In the last century Mussulman Collectors gathered the Company's land tax in Bengal, Mussulman Foujdars and Ghatwals officered its Police. A great Mussulman Department, with its headquarters in the Nawab Nizam's palace at Murshidabad, and a network of Mussulman officials over every district in Lower Bengal, administered the Criminal Law. Mussulman Jailors kept ward over the prison population of Northern India; Kazis or Mahomedan Doctors of Law presided in the Civil and Domestic Courts. When the Company first attempted to administer justice by means of trained English officers in its Bengal possessions, the Mahomedan Law Doctors still sat with them as their authoritative advisers on points

of law. The Code of Islam remained for many purposes the law of the land, and the ministerial and subordinate offices of Government continued to be the almost hereditary property of the Mussulmans.

But with the introduction of English education,

the Hindus began to pour into every grade of official life; and the State system of education in 1854 completed the revolution.

Teaching disappeared everywhere, even in the mosques. After the Mahomedan conquest of India, the mosques had become

the centres of educational activity, and were supported by imperial or local grants of land.

But the mosques now ceased teaching, even in Lower Bengal, the Province which,

a hundred years previously, was officered by a few Englishmen, a sprinkling of Hindus, and a multitude of Mahomedans.

The Mussulmans lost all ground.

It became apparent that Western instruction was producing not only a redistribution of employments but also an upheaval of races.

BRITISH SYMPATHY WITH MUSSULMANS

The Government of India, that is, the English Gentlemen, both in England and in India, directly concerned in carrying on the administration of India, became alarmed at this state of things. The English people, generally, were grieved at the mistaken, yet noble, race of Indian Mussulmans thus going fast to ruin. Despatch after despatch was sent to India to do something for the Mussulmans. Special facilities were ordered. Some Mussulmans were after all found willing to receive liberal education, and these in their turn organized themselves into a body to educate others, and thus arose the educated class of Mussulmans. The Mussulmans are noted for their gratitude. Some persons seem to have put it into their heads that Government as a body disapproved of their subjects criticising the measures of the administration. Hence that educated class, honestly, though mistakenly, opposes the Congress movement. As to the second class, their interest lies in keeping the

Mussulmans ignorant, so as to turn such ignorance and the consequent credulity to their own advantage.

ALLEGED MAHOMEDAN OBJECTION TO THE CONGRESS

The following appear to be the objections of the Mussulmans to the Congress :—

1. That it is against their religion to join the Congress, as by joining the Congress they will be joining the Hindus who are not Mussulmans.

2. That it is against their religion to join the Congress, as by joining the Congress they will be joining a movement opposed to Government, a thing which is opposed to their religion, which directs obedience and loyalty to Government, albeit Government may not be treating them properly.

3. That it is against their religion to learn the English language.

4. That the success of the Congress would weaken the British Rule, and might eventually end in the overthrow of British Power and the substitution of Hindu Rule.

5. That Government is against the Congress movement; that in addition to the duty of loyalty, the Mussulmans owe the duty of gratitude to Government for giving them a liberal education; therefore by joining the Congress, the Mussulmans would be guilty of the sin of ingratitude towards Government.

6. That the Congress does not adequately represent all the races of India.

7. That the motives of the persons constituting the Congress are not honest.

8. That the aims and objects of the Congress are not practical.

9. That the Congress is not important enough to deal satisfactorily with the subjects it takes up.

10. That the modes of Government prevailing in the West, namely, examination, representation, and election, are not adapted to India.

11. That such modes are not adapted to Mussulmans.

12. That the result of the application of Western methods to India would be to place all offices under Government in the power of the Hindus, and the Mussulmans would be completely ousted from Government employment.

13. That Government employment should be conferred not on the test of examinations, but by selection on the ground of race, position of the family, and other social and local considerations.

14. That public distinctions, such as seats on the Legislative Councils, Municipal Boards, and other public bodies should be conferred not by the test of election, but by nomination based on the ground of race, and social influence and importance.

15. That inasmuch as the Congress is a representative body, and inasmuch as the Hindus formed the majority of the population, the Congress will necessarily be swamped by the Hindus, and the resolutions of the Congress will, to all intents and purposes, be the resolutions of the Hindus, and the Mussulmans' voice will be drowned, and, therefore, if the Mussulmans join the Congress, they will not only not be heard, but will be actually assisting in supporting Hindus to pass resolutions against the interest of the Mussulmans, and to give color to such resolutions as the resolutions of Hindus and Mussulmans combined, and thus aiding in passing resolutions against themselves and misleading Government into believing that the Mussulmans are in favour of such resolutions.

16. That Mussulman boys have to learn the languages appertaining to their religion before joining schools; they are, therefore, at a disadvantage in the start for English education as compared with the Hindus. That the result is, that the Hindus pass the examinations, and as Government employment is given upon the test of examinations, the Mussulmans are necessarily ousted from Government employment, and it follows that the test of examination is not a fair test.

17. That as employments are given on the test of examinations, the result is that Hindus get such employment, and even in districts where the majority of the population are Mussulmans, the Hindus form the subordinate officialdom. That the Hindus being hostile to the Mussulmans, lord it over them, and the Mussulmans are naturally grieved to be lorded over by the Hindus, that in many cases these Hindus are from the lower strata of society, and in that case they tyrannise the more and thus aggravate the harsh treatment of the Mussulmans. That the result is that the Mussulmans, and amongst them Mussulmans descended from royal and noble families, are mortified at being not only ruled over, but even molested by and tyrannised over, in all manner of ways by Hindus, and Hindus of the lowest orders.

ANSWERS TO MAHOMEDAN OBJECTIONS

I now proceed to answer these objections :

1. Mussulmans in the past—Mussulmans not in name only but orthodox, true Mussulmans—constantly travelled in foreign lands and mixed with all the nations of the world. The

Mussulmans in India are the descendants of the Mussulmans who thus travelled to and settled in India, and of the Hindus whom such Mussulmans converted to Islam. All the Mussulmans in India have always lived side by side with the Hindus and mixed with them and even co-operated with them, both during the period of the Mussulman Rule, as also since then. In fact, both the Mussulmans and the Hindus, as also older races residing in this country, are all equally the inhabitants of one and the same country, and are thus bound to each other by ties of a common nativity. They are all sharers in the benefits and advantages, as also in the ills, consequent on common residence; and so far as natural and climatic conditions are concerned, all the inhabitants, irrespective of all other considerations, are subject to common joys and common sorrows and must necessarily co-operate with each other, as humanity is imperfect and dependent on co-operation. Again, both the Mussulmans and the Hindus are subjects of the same sovereign and living under the protection of the same laws, and are equally affected by the same administration. The object of the Congress is to give expression to the political demands of the subjects, and to pray that their political grievances may be redressed and their political disabilities may be removed; that the political burdens of the country may be lightened and its political conditions may be ameliorated; that the political status of millions of human beings who are their fellow-countrymen may be improved, and their general condition may be rendered more tolerable. It is a most meritorious work, a work of the highest charity. No nobler or more charitable work could possibly be conceived. The only question is whether there should be two separate organisations, Mussulman and non-Mussulman, both simultaneously doing the same work, separate in name, but identical in nature and interest; or whether there should be a joint organisation. Obviously, the latter is preferable, especially as the Congress has no concern whatever with the religion or the religious convictions of any of its members.

2. It is not true that the Congress movement is a movement in opposition to Government. It is a movement for the purpose of expressing the grievances of the subjects to Government in a legal and constitutional manner, and for the purpose of asking Government to fulfil promises made by Government, of its own free will and pleasure; in fact, it is the duty of all truly loyal subjects—subjects desirous of seeing the Government maintained in its power—to inform Government of their own wants and wishes as it is also the duty of Government to ascertain the wants and wishes of subjects and, indeed, those subjects who will not keep the Government well informed of their own wants and wishes cannot be called true friends of Government. We are all aware that the English nation, our common fellow-subjects, always makes it a point to inform Government of its own wants and wishes, so that Government may be able to fulfil such wants and wishes. In

the case of India, moreover, promises have been made from time to time by Government to concede certain privileges; indeed, we have the plighted word of our Most Gracious Sovereign herself confirming those promises. It is our duty, therefore, to remind Government of such promises and to ask it to fulfil them.

3. Language is but the medium of expression. Orthodox and true Mussulmans have in their time learned the Greek, the Latin, and other languages. There is, therefore, nothing against learning any language. In fact, many Mussulmans of India, indeed, most of them learn and speak languages other than the language of their religion. The objection, therefore, against learning the English language, which is moreover the language of our rulers, is so absurd on the face of it, that it need not be further adverted to.

4. The object of the Congress has already been stated. The success of the Congress, as has also been stated, instead of weakening Government, will only contribute towards the greater permanence of British rule in India. The Mussulmans, therefore, need not be frightened by phantoms created by their own imagination.

5. It is the duty of all good boys, who have by the liberal policy of their fathers been enabled to receive a liberal education, to repay the kindness of their fathers, by assisting their fathers in the management of their affairs with the aid of such education and by contributing to the maintenance and welfare of the family by all honest means in their power. Similarly, it is the duty of those subjects who have received a liberal education with the aid of Government, to repay the kindness of Government by assisting Government in the proper discharge of its high functions by informing Government of the shoals and rocks lying ahead in its path and thus enabling Government to steer clear of such shoals and rocks, and not to lie by quietly with a false sense of gratitude and leaving Government to run against such shoals and rocks and thus unintentionally, of course, but nevertheless contribute to its grounding ashore. True gratitude lies in true good wishes and true good assistance, and not in false modesty and indolence.

6. If the Congress does not, as is alleged, adequately represent all the races, surely the fault lies, not on the shoulders of the Congress leaders who invite all the races, but on the shoulders of those races themselves who turn a deaf ear to such invitation, and prefer not to respond to it. It is the duty of such races, in response to such invitation, to attend the Congress and not blame the Congress when, in fact, they ought to blame themselves.

7. All public bodies, assembled in public meetings, desirous of giving every publicity to their proceedings and even keeping a public record of its transactions, ought to be judged by their

sayings and doings. It is not right or proper to attribute to such bodies improper motives, unless such motive can be fairly and reasonably inferred from their sayings or doings or both. In fact, no person, having any sense of self-respect, ought to attribute improper motives, unless he is prepared to prove the same, and it is to be hoped, for the honor of the Mussulmans, to cease from making reckless charges which they are not prepared to substantiate.

8. As to the aims and objects of the Congress not being practical, it is a well known fact that public attention has been drawn to the demands of the Congress, and not only the classes but even the masses have already been awakened to a sense of their political grievances and disabilities. Government has also been pleased to take into its favourable consideration the demands of the Congress, and has partially conceded the expansion of the Legislative Councils and introduced the element of election therein. Indeed, if the Congress movement is continued with the same ability, prudence and sagacity that have characterised it in the past, and especially if those who have hitherto contented themselves with simply throwing out objections begin in right earnest to take part in the movement, the movement is certain to bear fruit in the very near future and to end in practical results.

9. As to the Congress not being important enough to deal with the subjects it takes up, it will not be denied that the Congress contains in its ranks some of the most educated, most wealthy and most influential men of the day, some of whom have occupied—and occupied honorably—public offices of trust and importance, and most of whom are leaders of their respective centres. In fact, in the Congress camp one comes across legislators, municipal councillors, rich zamindars, extensive merchants, renowned lawyers, eminent doctors, experienced publicists, indeed, representatives of every industry and every profession in the land. In fact, it will be hard—nay impossible—to name any other non-official public body equally important with the Congress.

10. As to the modes of government prevailing in the West not being adapted to India, the position stands as follows: In a primary state of society, whilst a particular small nation, confined to a narrow strip of territory, is governed by a single ruler, who generally belongs to that nation and is residing in that territory, as the nation is not a numerous one and the territory not a large one, the ruler is necessarily in daily and constant touch with his subjects. The affairs of the State are of a very limited nature and do not occupy much time of the ruler. Moreover, there are not special or local circumstances of sufficient importance to be taken into consideration. The affairs of the State are of a simple nature. The offices are not many and do not require special merits for their proper performance. Whenever, therefore, the ruler has to appoint to a post, the ruler himself is qualified to do so. He does not find it necessary to resort to any complicated method for the performance

of this part of his duty. Hence the posts are filled without compelling the candidates to undergo the trouble of going through any definite or complicated course of instruction or examination. As the nation, however, increases in numbers, as the territory is enlarged and the needs of society become more numerous and more complicated, the number of the posts to be filled becomes greater, and the qualifications required for the proper performance of the posts grow higher and are of diverse character. The touch of the ruler with each one of the ruled gets less and less, and the ruler cannot possibly keep himself personally abreast of a knowledge of the increased and complicated needs of the people. He becomes, in fact, less qualified to properly fill up all the posts, and he is compelled to delegate this part of his duty to others. In course of time, he discovers that it is not a very satisfactory thing to nominate to posts by means of deputies and that some definite method of selection must be substituted. The considerations which formerly guided him, when he alone had personally to nominate, are of such a vague character when placed in the hands of his deputies, that he finds that it is not only not useful but even mischievous to resort to them as, instead of such considerations being in fact given weight to, they simply open a wide door to undue influence and even bribery, and he finds it necessary to discard them and is compelled to limit himself to selection by a public examination of candidates, after they have gone through a course of instruction laid down for the purpose. Thus it happens that all other qualifications such as of family, standing and position and others come to be dispensed with, and the test of public examinations, that is, of personal merit alone, as tested by such examinations, is substituted. It may be conceded at once that it is not a perfect or infallible test. It is a choice of evils. In order, however, to guard so far as possible against the evil of dispensing with the other considerations, a certain proportion of the posts is reserved to be filled up by the original method of nomination and the examination test is resorted to for filling up initial posts alone, and promotion is guided by seniority and merit combined. The circumstances above set forth are not peculiar to any particular country or climate, but are equally applicable to all, and it is not correct to say that the above method is a peculiarly Western method and not applicable or adapted to India. In fact, in China, which is peculiarly an Eastern country, the same method has been of universal application for many centuries past. Moreover, the present rulers of India happen to be foreigners, and in their case, therefore, the considerations, which have led to the method of examination being adopted, apply with even greater force. The above considerations also apply to the method of election and representation, though not with the same force or to the same extent. Hence election and also nomination in the case of Local Boards, Municipal Corporations, Legislative Councils, and the like. It has been suggested by the Honorable Haji Mohamed Ismail Khan, of the

North-West Provinces, that the Congress should pass a resolution "recognising the absolute necessity of equality of number of Hindu and Mahomedan elected members in Legislative Councils, District Boards and Municipalities. . . and wishing all Hindus and Mahomedans to elect accordingly". It is a good suggestion, but so long as Mussulmans do not join the Congress movement in the same numbers and with the same enthusiasm as the Hindus do, the Congress cannot in fairness be asked to carry out such a suggestion in the manner and to the extent indicated in the suggestion.

11. As to the modes of government prevailing in the West not being adapted to Mussulmans, the observations in answer to objection No. 10 also apply to this objection. The Mussulmans may be reminded that our Holy Prophet did not name a successor. He left it to the believers to elect one for themselves. The Caliph or the successor was originally freely chosen by the free suffrages of the believers and was responsible to them for his acts. In later times this practice was altered, and the Caliphs were made hereditary; but this was done by the confidence and the consent of the believers. But even to this day, the sanction of the believers in the shape of Biat, is deemed necessary. "The Government of India," says Mr. Ahmed Riza, "is therefore in the hands of an elective monarch, limited in the exercise of his powers by prescriptive religious traditions. According to Mussulman Law, if the Caliph departs from these traditions, the body of the learned (Ulema) is armed with the right of remonstrating, and is even able to depose him. Amongst these traditions, there is one which makes it obligatory on the Caliph not to do, or even to resolve on, any act without first seeking the advice of the chiefs of the tribes and the doctors of the law—a principle very characteristic of Representative Government. According to Mussulman Law, the Caliph is bound to be just, to respect the liberties of the people, to love his subjects, to *consider their needs*, and *listen to their grievances*" "It is clear that Islam knew how to determine and regulate the rights and duties of the sovereign, even before England essayed the task." Islamism has no caste. "Let all your subjects," said Frederick the Great, "have the right to address you directly both in speech and writing." "The Mussulmans," says Mr. Ahmed Riza, "are free from clerical domination, and know nothing of rank or social grade." Said Ali, the fourth Caliph, "superiority in knowledge is the highest title of honor". "The spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion" of the Mussulmans was remarkable. Mussulman cities were "full of savants and men of letters." "Roman Law and Greek Science continued their evolution among the Arabs." "The best of Holy Wars," said our Holy Prophet, "is the righteous word spoken to a monarch who is acting tyrannically." "Islam knows no master; the Commander of the Faithful is only the chosen servant of the people." "Obedience to a Chief is limited; it is founded on the presumption that

the Chief commands in the name of the law and in the interests of him who obeys." "Obey me, said Abu Bakr (the first Caliph), "so long as I go on in good practices. If I deceive myself, warn me. If you do not, you will be responsible." "The Government of Islam is a collective authority in which every free citizen, in possession of his mental faculties, is bound by a common destiny, and shares its responsibilities." "Islamism is not occupied with supra-mundane interests alone. It does not say: 'Leave to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.' It teaches its adepts that they have a civil duty to fulfil here below, and especially the duty of controlling the conduct of Cæsar." Election and Representation as also Universal Brotherhood are the characteristics of Islam and ought not to be objected to by Mussulmans. All Mussulmans are equal, and if they want any employment, they must, like the rest, pass public examinations. If they want any position of rank, they must endeavour to be fit for such position and resort to election like the rest. Of course, if they can gain such position by nomination, they must thank their good fortune, but if they cannot, they have no right to grumble. They may contend, however, that so far as examinations are concerned, they are at a disadvantage, as compared with the Hindus. If that is so, it is no doubt a misfortune. But surely they must rely on merciful Providence and put their own shoulders to the wheel, and by the grace of God they are bound to succeed in their efforts; nay even more, if they have more difficulties to overcome than the Hindus, so much the more creditable will be their success to them, and so much the more will they be qualified, not only for the initial posts, but for higher promotion. In fact, even in India we find that when Mussulmans do really take to liberal education, they generally equal, if not even surpass, the other races, and that Mussulmans are good not only in matters requiring muscle and valour, but also mental powers and intellectual vigour, and the Mussulman community of India can produce distinguished and deeply learned scholars, such as Mr. Justice Budruddin, Mr. Justice Ameer Ali and Mr. Justice Mahmood, and here it may be remarked in passing that if Mussulmans in India have a few more leaders of educational advancement, of the calibre and energy, and persistence and devotion, of the type of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, who has by his lifelong services done a great deal for Mussalman in this matter, and whose name will be remembered with gratitude and admiration for a long time to come, Mussulman education is bound to prosper. The Mussulmans may further contend that in elections they will be swamped. All that may be said here is that they are mistaken in thinking so. They have simply to try, and they will find that they will have no reason to complain. Assuming, however, that they are unsuccessful, notwithstanding their honest endeavours and notwithstanding their fitfulness, why, then Government will, for its own safety, be compelled to come to their help. Objections 12, 13, 14 and 16 have already been answered.

15. It does not follow that, because the Hindus form the majority of the Congress, that the Resolutions of the Congress will be the Resolutions of the Hindus. It is a standing rule of the Congress, solemnly passed and recorded that if any proposal is disapproved of by the bulk of either the Hindus or the Mussulmans, the same shall not be carried. Again, the Congress is not a meeting of shareholders in a Joint-Stock Company or any other body formed for the gain of profit or for private interests, and a numerical majority does not and cannot influence its decisions—decisions by the bye, which cannot affect anybody as they are simply expressions of opinion, and as such must necessarily depend on their intrinsic sense and reasonableness to carry any weight with Government for whose benefit they are passed. Again, so long as the Congress leaders happen to be men of education and enlightenment, men of approved conduct and wide experience, men, in fact, who have a reputation to love, the Congress will never be allowed to run its course for the benefit of sectional, private or party purposes. Again, if the Mussulmans attend Congress meetings, surely the Congress shall be bound to hear and to give careful consideration to Mussulman views, and arguments founded on facts and reason are bound to prevail. Assuming, however, that the Congress is reduced to a rabble meeting, which is not probable, why, then it will lose its position and nobody will pay any attention to its resolutions.

The Mussulmans, however, instead of raising puerile and imaginary objections from a distance, should attend Congress meetings and see for themselves what is going on in such meetings; indeed, they will find that even when one member puts forward cogent reasons in opposition to the proposal, such proposal is eventually dropped.

17. If the complaint in regard to the conduct referred to in the objection be correct, it may be mentioned that such conduct is not popular to any particular race.

It is in the nature of things that persons of low origin, born and brought up in the atmosphere of low morals, should, on finding themselves suddenly clothed with the authority of the Sircar, get their heads turned and be led into playing the tyrant. The less the education they have received, and the smaller the emoluments their posts carry, the greater their superciliousness, the more marked their contempt for others. Cringing to superior authority, and lording it over the people who have anything to do officially with them, are the distinguishing traits of these posts of society. Persons of high birth and culture, who have seen better days and better society, may sometimes be naturally inclined to give to these supercilious tyrants a sound thrashing so as to make them remember it to the end of their days and prevent them from

reverting to their evil ways. But persons of high birth and culture naturally recoil from doing anything which may savour of vulgarity, and hence their silent sufferings. Government has been ever ready and willing to check high-handedness and insulting conduct on the part of their native subordinate officials. Europeans both official and non-official, lovers of manliness and justice as they are, strongly disapprove their *hauteur*. But no Government, however watchful and however anxious it may be, can possibly completely eradicate the evil, the true remedies for the removal of which are as follows: The standard of education required of candidates for subordinate official posts should be gradually raised higher and higher so as to compel the candidates to have better education, better culture, in order to make them forget the evil surroundings of their previous life and to take to a better appreciation of the moral law of nature. At the same time education should be disseminated all over the land, and the standard of education of the masses, should be gradually and steadily raised, so that the masses, armed with the weapon of education, may not have meekly to submit to petty tyrannies, but may know how to protect themselves against them and to bring the offenders to a proper sense of their perverseness and the impropriety of their conduct by means of union and the agitation of their grievances, and in legally provokable cases by bringing the culprits to their well-deserved punishment.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF ISLAM

All who believe in one God and acknowledge the Holy Prophet are true believers. The fundamental principles of Islam are few and simple. Islam knows no castes and ought not to have divisions and sub-divisions. Yet we find Islam divided into sects, into innumerable divisions. This is certainly against the spirit of Islam. All true believers are equal. By Mussulman Law they can all eat with each other, nay more, they can eat with the followers of the Great Prophets on whom Revelation has descended. All Mussulmans can intermarry, nay more, Mussulman males can marry females from the followers of the Great Prophets. Yet the different sects of Indian Mussulmans will not intermarry, even amongst themselves. It is the duty of all true believers to educate themselves, their wives and their sons and their daughters so as to enable them to know God aright. Yet ignorance is the prevailing rule amongst Indian Mussulmans. Mussulman females are free. Marriage is a contract in which the husband

and the wife are parties. Females have independent property. Yet amongst Indian Mussulmans there are frequent cases of maltreatment of wives. The Musjids are places of worship as also places for giving education, and places of meeting for discussion of social and political matters. Yet discussion and consideration and expression of opinions is an exceptional thing amongst Indian Mussulmans. Freedom of speech and liberty of action consistent with a few fundamental and world-recognised principles are the birthright of Mussulmans. Yet Indian Mussulmans are content to sit idle. To point out to the rulers their own grievances and to ask redress for them is the privilege of Mussulmans. Yet Indian Mussulmans prefer to remain silent. To be active and to be energetic, to be enterprising and to be fearless, has been the characteristic of the faithful. Yet Indian Mussulmans prefer to remain indolent and apathetic. Are not Indian Mussulmans, then, to blame themselves? If the Indian Mussulmans once shake off their lethargy and rid themselves of their apathy, if they unite together and love each other, as members of the same fold, as brothers of a Universal Brotherhood, mix with each other and intermarry, educate themselves, and their wives and children, and meet together and exchange opinion and voice their grievances and generally endeavour to raise themselves and actively co-operate in the raising of their brethren, they have under merciful Providence as bright a future before them as they had a glorious past. The Indian Mussulmans are a brave and generous race, and it is natural that they should smart under the misfortunes that have overtaken them and resent the treatment that has been and is extended to them. But certainly apathy and lethargy are not the means calculated to reinstate them in anything like their former greatness. Relying, therefore, upon merciful Providence and True Religion, and placing confidence in Almighty God, the Creator of the Universe and the Dispenser of all things, they must rise equal to their present trials, and it is to be fervently hoped that the Benign Ruler may have mercy upon them and raise them again to prosperity and good fortune.

MAHOMEDAN EDUCATION

One of the obvious means by which Indian Mussulmans can raise themselves is education. It is stated that there are five crores of Mussulmans in India. It is further stated that the average annual income per head of population in India is rupees twenty-seven. If so, the average annual income of Indian Mussulmans ought to be rupees one hundred and thirty-five crores. The Zakat or tax on this income at the rate of two-and-a-half per cent. comes to nearly rupees three crores. Making all possible allowances for those who may be exempted from payment of Zakat, and for that purpose reducing it to one-tenth, we can have the splendid annual sum of rupees thirty lakhs, that is, at the rate of one anna per annum per head of Mussulmans in India, which is certainly not a very heavy average annual payment. If all the Indian Mussulmans join together and voluntarily contribute as above suggested, they will thereby be fulfilling one of the main commandments of Islam, and thus performing an act of duty. With this magnificent sum, schools for primary, secondary and higher education can be established and maintained, and in such schools education as also food and clothing to students may be given, and there will thus every year be maintained, lodged and educated thousands and thousands of Indian Mussulman youths. Government will have, under the grant-in-aid rules, to contribute to this sum, and thus the total sum will be materially increased. If this system is established and continued, in the course of a few years education will have permeated all ranks of Indian Mussulmans, and the condition of the whole body will have become so much improved as to be a matter for admiration. What is wanted is voluntary performance on the part of all Indian Mussulmans of a strictly religious duty and on the part of the leaders co-operation and good management, and it is to be devoutly wished that Mussulmans in every part of India, instead of scouting the idea, will allow good sense for once to overcome apathy and lethargy and give to this suggestion a sympathetic consideration.

MAHOMEDAN MORAL CODE

It may be observed here in passing that it is sometimes contended in disparagement of the Indian Mussulmans that "Islam is unfit to be a moral code for a nation to live in": that "the faith of the Islam is incompatible with good Government and with the happiness of a people". Both the above accusations are absolutely false. In fact, the tenets of Islam are inherently capable of good Government and good and happy subjects. The very first and most fundamental doctrine of Islam that there is no God but God, that is but one God, is not only the true doctrine, but also binds the true believer to be a respectable man, and, if Mussulmans have become degenerated, it is not on account, but in spite, of Islam. Another fundamental doctrine is that of prayers. Prayers bring the human being in personal contact with his Creator. Another fundamental doctrine is that of observing fast, which teaches men by personal experience to think of the miseries of their fellow-human beings. Another fundamental doctrine is that of charity, and which has been admitted all over the earth and in all times to be an excellent virtue. Another fundamental doctrine is that of Haj, which, apart from its religious benefit, has all the benefits of travel. There is nothing, therefore, in Islam to cause degeneracy; on the other hand, there is everything in Islam to make Mussulmans loyal subjects and good citizens.

ENGLAND AND INDIA COMPARED AND CONTRASTED

If you will look at the map of India, you will find that India has the appearance of a one-legged horse. India has from time to time been a prey to foreign invasions from without and to internecine wars within. Famine periodically visits the land, and so does plague. English Rule has, however, stopped foreign invasion, and the Pax Britannica has put an end to internecine wars. Western arts and Western methods are employed to prevent—at all events to check—famine and plague, to keep them within gradually diminishing limits, and under steadily increasing control it is to be hoped that these monster evils will, in

the near future, be completely laid at rest. The resources of the country are being gradually developed and its trade is increasing. Public expenditure, however, under British Rule, is increasing by leaps and bounds far beyond the national income that is at present realized, or that can reasonably be expected to be realized in the near future. The average income per year per head of population is, in England £33 (thirty-three pounds sterling); in France £23 (twenty-three pounds sterling); in Russia over £9 (nine pounds sterling); in Turkey in Europe £4 (four pounds sterling); whilst in India, it is only Rs. 27 (twenty-seven rupees) or at 1s. 4d. per rupee, £1-14-6 (one pound sterling, fourteen shillings and six pence). Thus the average income per year per head of population of India is about one-nineteenth of the average income per year per head of population in England; or, in other words, so far as the annual income is concerned, nineteen times better off than India, or India is nineteen times worse off than England. Again, the population of India is mostly agricultural. The ratio of town population to country population in India is one to twelve, that is, the agricultural population of India is twelve-thirteenth of the total population of the country. In England, the ratio of town population to country population is two to one, that is, the agricultural population in England is only (one-third) of the total population of the country. Thus town population as compared to country population, is in England 24 to 12, whilst in India it is 1 to 12; or, in other words, so far as the ratio of proportion of town population to country population is concerned, England is 24 (twenty-four) times better off than India. Again the population of British India is, in round numbers, 22 (twenty-two) crores, whilst the total imperial taxation in round numbers, is Rs. 95 (rupees ninety-five) crores, or, in round numbers, Rs. 4-8 (rupees four and annas eight) per head of population; and as the average annual income per head is Rs. 27 (rupees twenty-seven), the percentage of taxation to annual income is $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 27, that is, sixteen-and-a-half per cent. The population of the United Kingdom is, in round numbers, about four crores, whilst the total Imperial taxation is a

little more than that of India and comes to about Rs. 25 (rupees twenty-five) per head; and as the average annual income per head is £33, the percentage of taxation to income comes to about six per cent. Thus, so far as the percentage of taxation to income is concerned, India is two-and-a-half times worse off than England. Moreover, it is a well known fact, the same percentage of tax to income, when levied on persons having good incomes, may be easily borne by them and may not be at all felt by them; when levied on persons having poor or small income—may be heavily felt—may even become wholly unbearable. In fact, this incidence is now well admitted in the case of income tax, and it is for this reason that on levying that tax, incomes under a certain amount are wholly exempted, and on incomes above that amount and up to a certain amount there is a sliding scale put into operation. Thus the ratio of $16\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of taxation to income, in the case of India, though nominally only two and-a-half times higher than the ratio in the case of England, is in incidence considerably more heavy, and India is therefore in reality considerably worse off than that ratio indicates. Again, in the year 1849-50, the population of British India was about fifteen crores, whilst the expenditure was about twenty-seven crores. In the year 1894-95, the population was about twenty-two crores, whilst the expenditure was about ninety-five crores. The increase in population, therefore, was about fifty per cent, whilst the increase in taxation was about three hundred and fifty per cent., that is, the growth of expenditure was about seven times the growth of population. During the same period, the charges of collection rose from 6.06 to 9.75, that is, more than fifty per cent; the expenditure on Civil administration rose from 6 to 14.83, that is, more than 240 per cent., and the expenditure on Army rose from 11.39 to 24.31, that is, more than 213 per cent. Again, the estimated debt of British India for the year 1895, is £127 (one hundred and twenty-seven million pounds), whilst that of Great Britain is £660 (six hundred and sixty million pounds). Thus, the Indian debt is about one-fifth of the British debt, whilst the

capacity of India for repayment of debt, as judged by the average annual income per head of population, is only one nineteenth! Again, the debt of Great Britain in the year 1875 was £ 780 (seven hundred and eighty million pounds); of India £ 130 (one hundred and thirty million pounds). Thus, from the year 1875 to the year 1895, the British debt is reduced by £ 120 (one hundred and twenty million pounds); whilst that of India, only by £ 3 (three million pounds). Again, the rate of interest on public loan in England, in the year 1875, was $3\frac{1}{4}$ (three and one-fourth) per cent. ; in India, 4 (four per cent.), and there is still a corresponding difference in favour of England and against India. Again, Great Britain annually pays, by way of interest, 12s. 9d, (twelve shillings and nine pence) per head ; and as the average annual income per head is £ 33 in England, the proportion of interest to income is nearly two per cent. India annually pays, by way of interest, annas three and pies nine per head ; and as the average annual income per head is Rs. 27 in India, the proportion of interest to income is nearly one per cent. Thus, a British subject, who so far as his average income is concerned, is nineteen times better off than a British Indian subject, has to pay by way of interest on national debt, only two per cent. out of his average income ; whilst an Indian subject, who, so far as his average income is concerned, is nineteen times worse off than a British subject, has to pay one per cent., that is, in this respect also, is nine times worse off than British subject. Again, the Imperial expenditure of the United Kingdom has risen from 81 (eighty-one million pounds in the year 1881 to 94 (ninety-four millions in the year 1895. This addition is caused, for the most part, by an increase of the Naval and Military expenditure from 25 (twenty-five) to 38 (thirty-eight millions), an exceptional and temporary measure. The charges of the national debt have decreased from 28 (twenty-eight) to 25 (twenty-five millions), and the debt itself from 770 (seven hundred and seventy) to 660 (six hundred and sixty millions). The imperial expenditure of India has risen from 71 (seventy-one crores in the year 1894. The charges on the national debt have,

contrary to what has happened in England, instead of decreasing, risen from Rs. 485 (four crores and eighty-five lakhs of rupees) in the year 1881 to Rs. 512 (five crores and twelve lakhs) in the year 1894, and the debt itself has increased from the year 1884, to the year 1894 as follows, that is, permanent debt in India from Rs. 93 (ninety-three crores) and odd to Rs. 104 (one hundred and four crores and odd), and permanent debt in England from 69,271,088 (sixty-nine millions and odd) Rs. 114, 005,826 (one hundred and fourteen millions and odd). Again the total land, according to the survey of India, is 539,848,840 (five hundred and thirty-nine and odd) acres. Of this, land actually cropped is 196,600,688; current fallows, thirty millions and odd; available for cultivation, 99 (ninety-nine millions and odd); not available for cultivation, 113 (one hundred and thirteen millions and odd). Forests, 62 (sixty-two millions). The average incident of Government Revenue per cultivated acre is one rupee three annas and two and two fifths pies. The population of British India is 22 [twenty-two crores]. The average acreage under food-crops is 18.60 [eighteen crores and odd]. The average of food-crops per acre [both irrigated and unirrigated is 0.31 ton or 694 (six hundred and ninety-four pounds.). The total of food-crops is 576 (five crores and seventy-six lakhs tons). The average consumption of foodgrains per head of the population per annum is 585 lbs. (five hundred and eighty-five pounds), or per day 1.60 lbs. (one pound and six-tenths pounds). The total consumption is 5.77 (five crores and seventy-seven lakhs tons). It is clear, from the above facts and figures, that India is a very poor country; that it is an agricultural country with but few manufactures, that Indians are a poor nation, living from hand to mouth—indeed, some of them actually starving and many of them having barely one meal a day! that taxation is very heavy; that charges for collection and the cost of administration, both Civil and Military, have increased far beyond the capacity of meeting them; that, notwithstanding the heavy taxation, the national debt—specially the gold debt and the charges to meet such debt—are steadily increasing.

• **BRITISH OPINIONS ON THE POVERTY OF INDIA**

That the Indians are a poor people, that they are overtaxed, that the Civil and Military expenditure of India is excessive, that the drain from India is of a ruinous character, that both justice and self-interest demand of our rulers that native labour should be more and more substituted for foreign labour and that all unproductive expenditure should be stopped, the following extracts from the speeches and writings of English Statesmen themselves make abundantly clear :

MR. BRIGHT in the House of Commons, 14th June, 1858 :—

The cultivators of the soil, the great body of the population of India, are in a condition of great impoverishment, of great dejection, and of great suffering.

LORD LAWRENCE, in 1864 :—

The mass of the people enjoy only a scant subsistence.

LORD LAWRENCE, before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, in 1873 :

The mass of the people of India are so miserably poor that they have barely the means of subsistence.

MAJOR BARING, Finance Minister of India, in his Budget Speech, 1882, after stating that the average income per annum per head of population in India is Rs. 27, says :

It is sufficiently accurate to justify the conclusion that the tax-paying community is exceedingly poor.

MR. GLADSTONE, in the House of Commons, 10th May, 1870, said that India was "too much burdened."

MR. BRIGHT, in his speech at the Manchester Town Hall, 11th December, 1877 :

I say that a Government. which has levied taxes till it can levy no more. and which has borrowed. more than all that it can levy.

MR. GLADSTONE, in the House of Commons, 20th June, 1893 :

The expenditure of India and especially the Military expenditure is alarming.

LORD SALISBURY :

India must be bled.

LORD SALISBURY, Secretary of State for India, Minute, 29th April, 1875 :

. . . where (in India) so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent.

MR. BRIGHT, in the House of Commons, 24th June, 1858 :

We must in future have India governed, not for a handful of Englishmen, ...

SIR GEORGE WINGATE, in "A few words on our Financial Relations with India," 1859 :—

They [taxes not spent in India] constitute. . . an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount withdrawn from the taxed country.

MR. FAWCETT, in the House of Commons, 5th May, 1868 :

Lord Metcalfe had well said that the bane of our system was that the advantages were reaped by one class and the work was done by another.

The DUKE OF ARGYLL, in the House of Lords. 11th March, 1869 :

I must say that we have not fulfilled *our duty* or the promises and engagements which we have made.

SIR GEORGE WINGATE, in "A few words on our Financial Relations with India," 1859 :

"Such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India. From this explanation some faint conception may be formed of the cruel, crushing effect, of the tribute upon India." "The Indian tribute, whether weighed in the scales of justice, or viewed in the light of our own interest, will be found to be at variance with humanity, with common sense. . . ."

LORD HARTINGTON, Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons, 23rd August, 1883 :

The Government of India cannot afford to spend more than they do on the administration of the country and if the country is

to be better governed, that can only be done by the employment of the best and most intelligent of the natives in the service.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, Secretary of State for India, in a letter to the Treasury, 1886 :

The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of public revenue is very peculiar from the character of the Government which is in the hands of foreigners who hold all the principal administrative offices and form so large a part of the Army. The impatience of the new taxation which will have to be borne wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country, and virtually to meet additions to charges arising outside of the country, would constitute a political danger the real magnitude of which, it is to be feared, is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge of or concern in the Government of India, but which those responsible for that Government have regarded as of the most serious order.

FINANCIAL RESULT OF BRITISH ADMINISTRATION

The table, recently prepared by Mr. W. Martin Wood, formerly Editor of the *Times of India*, whose knowledge of Indian finance and economics is surpassed by few, and who in his retirement still takes a deep and abiding interest in Indian affairs, gives the financial condition of the country at a glance.

Again, in the words of another Englishman, money is leaving the country without commercial "equivalent" to the tune of £25,000,000 [twenty-five millions pounds] yearly, or if you take the present fall of the rupee into consideration, then to the tune of forty millions of pounds yearly. In short, it is as clear as possible that the ability of the country to bear any fresh taxation is exhausted, and any further burden on the taxpayers would simply break their back—a dangerous consequence to be avoided at all hazard. Yet it is stated that Indians should remain silent, forsooth because it will be an act of disloyalty to discuss, aye, even to discuss in a loyal and constitutional manner with the best of motives, honourable in themselves and calculated to ensure the safety of the country and the maintenance of the British Rule in India, moderate measures of reform. It is

true that English Rule in India has done much for India, but much more yet remains to be done, and it is a matter of extreme surprise as well as of deep regret that the sort of supercilious objection above referred to comes from people who, to say the least of it, ought to know better. With the above facts and figures, and it is certainly not an overdrawn picture glaring in their faces, all true lovers of their country, and all its inhabitants, and all its rulers, possessing the most ordinary common sense, if they have even a spark of humanity left in them, ought to bestir themselves, and leaving aside all differences arising from difference of race or creed and forgetting even just resentment, if there is any, join with their fellow-countrymen in the movement—sober and temperate as it is—expressly organised for the amelioration of the country, of their countrymen, themselves included. The objectionists should remember that even the most honest and the best regulated administration has constant need of proper criticism even at the best of times. For all Governments are, in their nature, monopolists, and as such have constantly to be watched and warned. In India moreover, on account of its foreign character, it is excessively bureaucratic, more than other Governments in the world are, and hence the greater necessity for constant watchful criticism on the part of the people. The Government of India, moreover, consisting as it does of capable and well-meaning gentlemen, is, from the nature of its position and constitution, between two conflicting interests, the interests of England and the interests of India, and it is the sacred duty of all loyal Indian subjects to strengthen the hands of the Government of India in its laudable efforts to obtain financial justice for India by moral support of the united Indian nation; and judged from this point of view, keeping aloof from the Congress movement is not only undesirable but may even merit censure.

MUSSULMANS AND ENGLISH EDUCATION

If the short sketch above given of the financial result of the British administration in India for one century only be correct, we are necessarily forced to ask

"if these be the results in the green leaf, what will they be in the dry wood?" And yet Indian Mussulmans still hold aloof, alike from western education and from those political movements among our countrymen to which Western education has given rise and, when appealed to, they talk of difficulties in their way and ask for special encouragement and special facilities and special privileges.

"Special encouragement to any class," said the Education Commission, "is in itself an evil, and it will be a sore reproach to the Mussulmans if the pride they have shown in other matters does not stir them up to a course of honourable activity; to a determination that whatever their backwardness in the past, they will not suffer themselves to be outstripped in the future; to a conviction that self-help and self-sacrifice are at once nobler principles of conduct and surer paths to worldly success than sectarian reserve or the hope of exceptional indulgence."

Indeed, it will be a happy day for India when the disproportion between the Mahomedans who ought to be at school, and those who are actually at school, is reduced to the lowest possible minimum, and the Indian Mussulmans, as a body, make it a point to educate their children and actively co-operate in all the public movements in the country generally and especially, "our good Congress, the germ of future federated Parliament. with hearts honest, true and unselfish" and participate in our great bloodless battle for justice and freedom and specially makes a beginning now when "all minor sources of anxiety are overshadowed by the cloud now impending over our beloved land in which we too plainly discern the gloomy spectre of famine frowning down upon a teeming, frugal and ceaselessly industrious population and join in asking a redress at the hands of government and in expressing disapproval of the mistaken system, whereby the entire resources of 229 millions of people are placed at the disposal of able and well-meaning men who are nevertheless foreigners, who cannot in the nature of things sufficiently and adequately appreciate the wants, the necessities, the real condition of the people over whom they rule, and are naturally, though unconsciously, drifting to the conclusion that India is to be ruled for the glory of Great Britain and

not for the good of her own people. That this system is a mistaken one and that a strong financial check is necessary is now admitted by eminent Englishmen themselves.

LORD WELBY AND SIR AUCKLAND COLVIN ON INDIAN FINANCIAL CHECK

Lord Welby, President of the Royal Commission now sitting, says :—

Sir David Barbour made a criticism, which I think all officers connected with Financial departments must allow as a criticism of general application, namely, that sufficient attention is not given by the departments in India to the financial question. They hardly appreciate the gravity of it, and do not forecast what the financial effect of the measures on which they are bent may be. That, of course, is a defect common to all Governments. The heads of different departments very seldom take a general view of the effect of their administration. They are anxious to carry out measures which they think are important.

Sir David Barbour says :—

I certainly think something is very desirable, that which would ensure greater attention being paid to financial consideration in connection with the Government of India. . . . I think it would be better for India, better all round, if more attention were given to the financial question, and if we went more slowly in periods of great apparent financial prosperity.

Sir Auckland Colvin agrees with Sir David Barbour in the opinion Lord Welby further says :—

The point of Sir David Barbour's criticism, I think might be put thus: that in a country like India, where deficits are more dangerous than they would be here, where new taxation is more difficult than it would be here, the Government, as a whole, does not give sufficient attention to what may be the financial results of measures which it adopts.

Whereupon Sir Auckland Colvin remarks :—

I agree entirely to that, that in a country where the taxpayer is an alien, and is not able to make his voice directly heard, the need of giving close attention to economy in administration is greater than it would otherwise be.

From these remarks, coming as they do from such high authorities, this Congress will be perfectly justified in coming to the conclusion that "the discussion upon the

Budget, both in India and in Parliament, needs to be converted from a force into a reality," and that all thinking and reasonable men will be justified in expecting all the races inhabiting British India to join the Congress and co-operate with it in the cause of their country and of themselves. Indeed, I have a presentiment, that in the very near future my co-religionists will not only join the Congress movement, but take active part in moulding it, and will deem it the highest price of their civic life to be permitted to preside at its sittings.

FAMINE AND POVERTY

I now come to the most absorbing topic of the hour. After a lapse of twenty years, famine has again overtaken a greater part of the country. The insufficiency of rainfall in Behar, in the North-West Provinces, in the Punjab, in parts of Central India, in many districts of Bombay and Madras and in Mysore, has already led to distress among those classes who habitually live from hand to mouth. The cultivators, whose impoverished condition is well known, are the greatest sufferers. Next come the class of small artisans and weavers, and then the day-labourers who barely eke out an anna per day as wages. The prices of food-grains in every one of the afflicted tracts went up high, in some cases 50 and 100 per cent. This occurrence was most unusual. It has seldom happened that at the very beginning of the season of scarcity, prices of wheat, rice, bajri, and the jowari have gone up so high as has been the case at present. That such a condition of affairs should have created a panic and led even to looting and rioting as in Sholapur, in Nagpur, and elsewhere is not unintelligible. The people seem to have been frightened at the insufficiency of food-grain. They naturally thought that if a limited stock of grain, at the very commencement of the scarcity, should raise prices so high, what might happen when the season advances and the stocks are exhausted? No doubt, the first impulse was to curse the Bania grain-dealer and lay on his head all their woes. But as the panic subsided, and as it became known that Government would spare no efforts to relieve the distressed, while

the long arm of charity may be expected to loyally assist the efforts of the State, prices went down a little. This may be taken as the situation at present. The weekly official reports show that upwards of two lakhs of persons in various parts of the country are already employed on relief work, and that as week after week advances, the number will swell till at last it may reach a maximum in April and May, the number of which it is impossible to forecast at present. Every presidential and provincial Government has been straining its nerve to do its level best to cope with the distress which really bespeaks well of the humanity of our Government. British civilisation could not tolerate famine. And the Head of the State has already declared from his place in the Council Chamber that his Government will endeavour to save life at all cost and all hazard. Let us all devoutly hope that it may be so able to achieve its noble intention without indulging in hope or prospect not founded on the realities or circumstances prevailing in the country. To entertain sanguine prospects which may not only be not realised but which may end in heavy mortality, otherwise preventible, would be grievous. For, when we recall to mind the disastrous mortality which took place in 1877-78, when, according to official accounts, over 50 lakhs of human beings perished, we cannot but contemplate with the gravest apprehension what may befall unhappy India at this dismal juncture, should the efforts and energy of the State, with all the ample resources and most perfect organisation at its command, be found to be not so satisfactory as the people have been led to expect. I do not mean to say that these efforts and energies will be wanting. But it is not unlikely that, here and there, owing to more sanguine estimates of food and fodder and other optimistic views, the same care and attention may not be paid. You may have on paper the most perfect Famine Code; but unless those entrusted with its work, from the highest to the lowest, do not fall short in carrying out its provisions by a variety of causes, it is not unlikely that mortality, otherwise preventible, may ensue. It is, therefore, the duty of every citizen and public body to

heartily second the efforts of our benign rulers in saving life. The Press, too, is doing an invaluable service in placing before the public from day to day all intelligence regarding the famished in various parts of the country. It is discharging a noble duty worthy of its sacred functions, and we cannot but express our gratitude to it for its enterprise which enables us to give such wide publicity to all intelligence in connexion with the famine. Its argus eyes can detect neglect, indifference of mismanagement anywhere, and enable the authorities concerned to set matters right at once. The primary and essential function is to see that relief is given in time, that it is not allowed to be too late when it may become impossible to save lives.

GOVERNMENT AND FAMINE

That the Government, as the Hon'ble Mr. Woodburn observed the other day, is in a better position to-day to cope, and cope effectively, with famine, than it was 20 years ago, is no doubt perfectly true. We have had two crores of irrigation works and seven crores of protective railways constructed since 1880 out of the Famine Fund. Facilities of communication have been vastly increased; many a tract of the country has been brought within the radius of our railways, both trunk and branch. All these are assuring elements in connection with the present famine which were wanting in 1877-78. But, while admitting these facts, we should not forget that despite branch or feeder railways, despite increased communications, despite other facilities of transit, if there be no sufficient food-stock in the country to move from the locality, where it may be a surplusage to one where it may be most wanted, then these appliances and resources are unhappily of no avail.

THE STOCK OF GRAIN IN INDIA

Thus the most pressing question of the hour is not irrigation or railways, but the stock of food in the country. For your own province, I was rejoiced to see the other day from the note issued by your public-spirited and energetic Lieutenant-Governor, that though there was an insufficiency

of rice, the surplus of the Burma crops, *plus* importations from Singapur and Saigon, might be able to supply it. The Upper Provinces, under the able administratorship of the equally energetic Sir Antony Macdonnell, are a wheat-consuming country. Though wheat has been less exported from those provinces last year for purposes of exports, it is not impossible that there may yet be a deficiency, and if that is so, wheat may be imported from Persia, and Russia, and even America though at a dear rate. Thus the wants of that populous, but very poor, province might be fairly supplied. It is needless for me to inform you that the N.-W. Provinces and Oudh have a population numbering $4\frac{3}{4}$ crores. But it is so poor on the whole that according to the weekly reports the largest number of persons *gratuitously* relieved are to be found in that province, and it also has the largest number of persons employed on relief works. But as regards the food-supply of the Central Provinces, Bombay, and Madras, I have not yet noticed full and detailed official estimates being placed before the public, and if that is so, I hope it will soon be done; for you will agree that an approximate knowledge of the stock vastly helps private enterprise and private charity between them to import grain and pour it into those localities where it is most needed.

STATISTICS OF THE FOOD-STOCK

But this question of the stock of grain shows clearly that India lives from hand to mouth. A leading weekly journal in Bombay, the *Champion*, gave statistics a few weeks ago, based on the figures of the outturn of food per acre as given by the Famine Commissioners, shewing that with a population of 22 crores in British India, the total quantity of food required, at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. per day per head, was 5·80 crores of tons, while the actual outturn of food-crops could not be estimated at more than 5·76 crore tons, taking 18·60 crore acres as the whole area cultivated for these, and computing the outturn at 3·1 ton or 694 lbs. per acre. These statistics would lead us to infer that the outturn of food just sufficed for the population. But there is an average export of 25 lakhs of

tons beyond the sea. If, then, exports were taken into account, the quantity actually retained for home consumption would be *pro tanto* diminished, that is to say, while the food required was 5·80 crore tons, the quantity available was only 5·51. This would signify a deficiency of 29 lakhs of tons which would mean insufficiency of grain for a crore of the population. If these statistics are wholly or even approximately correct and we have no reason for thinking they are not as they are founded on official figures, you may imagine, how perilous is the situation. The late Sir James Caird observed that India had no food-stock surplus to last even for ten days. Since he made that statement, which has never been contradicted, population has vastly increased, while the area annually cultivated for food-crops is barely enough. A further comparison shows that the area sown for non-food crops is relatively larger, as may be seen from the following table :—

	In crores of acres.		Percentage of increase.
	1880-81.	1894-95.	
Total food-crops ...	16·62	18·62	12
Total non-food crops ...	2·15	3·90	81

Thus, while the acreage of food-crops has only increased 12 per cent. in fifteen years, the acreage of non-food crops has increased 81 per cent., or almost doubled. Though it is a matter of satisfaction to know that the area for merchantable crops has increased almost double, that the area for food-crops should not show the same growth is a matter not only for regret but for deep reflection by every one interested in the better welfare of the country, so far as the annual food-supplies are concerned.

LAND REVENUE IN CASH INSTEAD OF IN KIND

To us, again, it is a further matter of regret that the substitution of the system of paying the land revenue in cash for that in kind, is having its pernicious effect on our ryot. Whatever may be the merits of the cash system, it is to be feared, it is not exactly suited to the cultivators of the country. The *kind* system previously in vogue was

automatic in its incidence, and so far was most conducive to the happiness of the ryot. Whatever the condition of the crops, he had enough food-grain to last him for domestic consumption. If the crop was 16 annas, he paid in proportion to the State in kind. If it was 8 annas, the proportion to be paid to the State would diminish. Thus, the State dues fluctuated according to the condition of the crops, while the factor of food for annual domestic consumption remained constant. This system, in a great measure, tended to alleviate distress at the very outset of the scarcity. The cash system is wanting in this element and so far is defective.

THE AGRARIAN PROBLEM

This leads me to rivet your attention on the great danger looming in the near future in connection with our agrarian problem. It is, I admit, a gigantic problem and has been staring our rulers in the face for many a year past. Now and again palliatives have been applied by means of legislation. But palliative measures, you will admit, are after all no permanent solution of the problem. A broad, comprehensive, and practical solution is imperative, and it will require the highest experience and statesmanship to devise a remedy which may cure the disease, which is growing year by year and deepening in its intensity. I entreat you all to reflect on this grave situation, for, to my mind, the greatest danger to our country, in the near future, is what may arise from agrarian agitation. There is nothing like the rebellion of the belly. Government has been for years most unwisely spending millions against the so-called external danger. The expenditure is said to be an insurance against invasions, and yet we have a terrible invasion arising from hunger within the country itself, while there is no serious effort yet made to build an insurance against such internal danger. This must be, to all of us, a matter of the deepest regret. Let it be our endeavour, to the best of our power and ability, to assist the Government in its arduous task by suggesting suitable remedies. Two years ago, Sir Antony Macdonnell, as the Home Secretary of the

Government of India, informed the public from his place in the Supreme Legislative Council, that Government had on the anvil such a broad and comprehensive solution of the agrarian difficulty. Let us hope that, as soon as the hands of the Government are free from famine, it may devote all its ability and energy on this important topic. Let it be the good fortune of our present Viceroy, the liberal and sympathetic Earl of Elgin, to inaugurate such a practical agricultural reform as may restore agricultural prosperity to India and extricate her ryots from their present impoverished and distressed situation and earn for his lordship a deep and lasting gratitude.

GROWING CIVIL AND MILITARY EXPENDITURE

The next subject of importance is that of the growing expenditure of the Administration, both in its Civil and Military branch.

The famine has conclusively demonstrated, beyond all other facts and all other statistics, the existence of the poverty of India, to which our patriotic Grand Old Man, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, has been persistently drawing the serious attention of our rulers. That one main source of that poverty is the annual drain of millions of the national wealth, is now admitted everywhere. None can deny the fact, however plausibly it may be explained away. When we come to analyse the cause of that drain, we are confronted with the enormous expenditure incurred in England on Civil and Military pensions, India Office Establishments, and what are generally called, Home Charges. More or less, they are undoubtedly the outcome of the costly foreign agency in the administration—a subject on which the Congress has continued to express its emphatic opinion from time to time during the twelve years of its existence. I do not propose to enter here into the detail of this grave economic phenomenon. But to us it is a matter of some satisfaction to know that, in respect to the costliness of the administration, there is now sitting a Royal Commission to investigate the whole subject, a Commission which is the direct fruit of the agitation by this Congress,

and by none more than Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir William Wedderburn. None can deny that, but for their strenuous exertions in Parliament to have this Commission appointed, India to-day would have been still without any inquiry. The last one was in 1874. But the Fawcett Committee, as it was called, concluded its sittings without a report.

ROYAL COMMISSION AND APPORTIONMENT OF HOME CHARGES

This Commission, however, has had now thirty sittings and has already recorded the evidence of expert officials, both in active employ and in retirement. Among the latter are two distinguished ex-Finance Ministers, Sir David Barbour and Sir Auckland Colvin, and Captain Hext. It is a gratification to see from their evidence that they have made out a strong case for greater control over the expenditure of the Government of India, specially Military and Naval; the two ex-Finance Ministers are of opinion that, with a *pro*-Military viceroy, the chances of his dominating his whole Council and incurring any amount of Military expenditure of an irresponsible character, in league with the Military element in the Executive Council, are many, which can be hardly said to be conducive to the interests of the already overburdened taxpayers. These retired officials have also given their opinion that the limits of taxation have been already strained, and pointed out the danger of further taxation. Sir David Barbour, again, has admitted that Parliamentary control over all expenditure, as wisely suggested by Sir William Wedderburn, is expedient. He will not, however, give his unqualified concurrence to the scheme which requires modification. So far it may be observed, that the evidence is satisfactory and in the very direction the Congress has for years been pointing out. Again, it must be said that the evidence of Sir Edwin Collen has completely established the contention of the Congress regarding the appalling growth of Military expenditure, even after making allowances for necessary and unavoidable increases. Mr. Stephen Jacob, too, whose evidence was

exhaustive, has made out a case as to the unfair character of expenditure which the Home Office foists on India. You are aware that the Congress, as well as the Government of India, are at one on the question of the apportionment of Home Charges. And Mr. Jacob's evidence is therefore eminently satisfactory in this respect. Let us, Gentlemen, do all in our power to further strengthen the hands of our Indian Government by once more placing on record our opinion regarding the financial injustice from which India has been suffering for many years past. If the Royal Commission does nothing else but recommend a fair apportionment of the charges to be borne by India and England respectively, it will have rendered the greatest service to this country and justified its appointment. Lastly, it is a pleasure to notice that, thanks to the persistent efforts of the representatives on behalf of India—Sir W. Wedderburn and Messrs. Dadabhai Naoroji and Caine—the Commission has at last allowed reporters to attend its sittings. Publicity adds to the value of public enquiry. The Congress owes a deep debt of gratitude to these gentlemen for their disinterested exertions throughout in this matter. Let me add here that my indefatigable friend, Mr. D. E. Wacha, has been elected by the Bombay presidency Association to proceed to England and to give his evidence before the Royal Commission, and I have no doubt whatever that, zealous and hard-working as he has been throughout his life in the cause of our country and a master as he is of the facts and figures regarding Indian finance, his evidence will be of very great use to us and assist the Commission in coming to the right conclusion.

DIVIDING THE COUNCIL ON THE INDIAN BUDGET

I will now proceed to another important topic on which not only the Congress has expressed its own views but every Provincial Conference in the country has done the same. I mean the reform, which is absolutely necessary and expedient, in connection with the discussion of Imperial and Provincial Budgets. Though we all appreciate the privilege conferred on the expanded

Legislative Councils to discuss the Budget, there is no power to move amendments and vote on it. So far all life is taken out of these Budget debates. And for all practical purposes the discussion is purely academic. Though this is the fourth year of the expanded Councils, the most pungent criticism on the Budget in the Imperial Council makes no difference whatever and has no practical effect. Though the representatives of the public give voice to public opinion in the Council Chamber, their utterances go unheeded. This is not a satisfactory state of matters. If Budgets are to be popular, and if the people and the Press are to influence these for good, it is essential that the Budgets should be voted upon. Otherwise, Budget discussions will remain the farces that they are, and it is to be earnestly hoped that our rulers will see their way to instituting an early reform in this matter. The fear that the Government may be over-ridden is groundless. There is not a Council in the Empire in which the official element does not preponderate, and it is absurd to expect that Government could at all be swamped. It is a curious anomaly that, though in Local Self-Government the representatives of the people can discuss their Civil finances, and divide on them, they cannot do so on the larger subject of the finances of the Province and the whole Empire. I repeat, therefore, the hope I have already expressed that the Government will, at an early date, see the reasonableness, aye, the justice, of our demand and grant us the same as conducive to the greater welfare and contentment of the people.

TRIBUTE TO THE DEAD

Since our last sitting at Poona, the cruel hand of death has deprived us of several of our most energetic workers, friends and sympathisers. Foremost among them stands the name of the late Mr. Mano Mohun Ghose, an enthusiastic and steady worker from the early years of this movement. His great abilities and rare legal acumen, his special study of Indian questions, especially the urgent need of the separation of judicial from executive functions, his untiring zeal and moderation, his great powers and

readiness in debate and widespread influence combined to make him best fitted to espouse his country's cause. His sudden and untimely removal from our midst leaves a blank which it will be hard to fill, but his services to the Congress will keep his memory always green in the annals of this movement. In the death of Rao Bahadur H. H. Dhruva of Gujarat a scholar of European reputation, who represented H. H. the Gaekwar at the Norway and Sweden Oriental Congress, our movement loses another worker, whose zeal and enthusiasm for the Congress knew no bounds; he went from village to village pleading the Congress cause, and spared neither time nor money in its advocacy. He was a District Judge on our side of the country, but as soon as he was freed from the trammels of office the first thing he did was to attend the Karachi Provincial Conference in the scorching heat of May last, and died within a fortnight of his return from that place. Western India, especially Gujarat, will long mourn his loss. By the death of Mr. C. Narayanaswami Naidu, of Nagpore, the Congress has lost another staunch supporter, to whose enthusiasm the entire success which attended the Nagpore Congress was due.

DIAMOND JUBILEE OF QUEEN VICTORIA

You are all aware that the reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen Empress of India has recently exceeded in duration that of any of Her Most Excellent Majesty's predecessors, (*cheers*) and that this auspicious event is to be celebrated in or about June next. Whatever may be the differences between the different races inhabiting this vast country on political or other grounds, the whole of India is unanimous in the opinion that Her Majesty has throughout her reign been ever anxious for the welfare of all her Indian subjects and has ever treated them with the same kindness and with the solicitude with which she has treated all her other subjects. To Her Majesty, all her subjects are equal without any distinction of caste, creed, race or colour. She is the ever affectionate mother of all her subjects, and all her subjects, whether near her or far away from her, are to her, her children.

(*Cheers.*) Whatever might be the political views of Her Majesty's Ministers for the time being, whoever might be in authority under Her Majesty in India, Her Majesty has throughout thrown the great weight of her high authority in favour of equal treatment of all her subjects alike. You are all aware of the great Proclamation from Her Majesty to the people of the country, and which Proclamation is rightly regarded by the people of this country as their great Charter and cherished accordingly. You are all aware that Her Majesty issued the said Proclamation unasked, and thus did an act of a signal, illustrious, very rare and unrivalled magnanimity, an act fraught with seeds of deep and abiding value. That she, the august Sovereign of an Empire, over which the sun never sets; that she, the constitutional ruler of a country that leads the advanced guard in the march of liberty and of civilization, should deign to look over and care for us, who have fallen back among stragglers in the rear, is in itself a proof of her high generosity. It is not for us, and in this place, to pass in review the important incidents of her long, glorious and illustrious reign. Suffice it to say that the Victorian era will be ever remembered throughout the British Empire with deep feelings of pride and pleasure and in the rest of the world with those of wonder and admiration. Let, therefore, this Congress of delegates from all parts of India humbly offer its dutiful and loyal congratulations to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen-Empress on her memorable beneficent and glorious reign, exceeding in length of time the reign of any of her predecessors, and heartily wish her many more and happy years of rule over the Great British Empire. Let us all fervently pray that benign and merciful Providence may shower over her its choicest blessings, and guide her in future, as it has guided her in the past, in the path of duty and of righteousness, and that she may be enabled to complete her glorious work in India by bestowing on her grateful Indian subjects the same rights and privileges as are enjoyed by her British subjects, by removing all disabilities which still cling to us, notwithstanding Her Royal Mandate to the country. By conferring on us the boon

we ask for in fulfilment of her own gracious Proclamation, Her Majesty will not only command the prayers of her Indian subjects, but also secure the sympathies of the whole civilized world. Her sagacious clemency will ever live in the hearts of her Indian subjects and will, indeed, assure the prosperity, as well as the continued and devoted loyalty of India. The English nation is well known for its manliness, and manliness is associated with love of justice, generosity and intellect. It is the force of character, as also the force of circumstances, that have given Englishmen their present power. In fact, they are masterful men, and we trust they will, therefore, join with us in our prayers to our and their Sovereign on this auspicious occasion, and thus assist in inaugurating a truly liberal measure of reform, and thereby earn credit and achieve a reputation of which all manly hearts ought to be proud.

It now remains for me to say that in the discussion of the several important matters that will be placed before you for consideration, you will show the same moderation, both of language and thought, as you have hitherto displayed. May merciful Providence guide us all, both you and myself, in the discharge of our duties on this important occasion, and may our deliberations contribute to the benefit of all concerned. (*Loud and prolonged cheering.*)

Thirteenth Congress—Amraoti—1897

THE HON. MR. C. SANKARAN NAIR

DIAMOND JUBILEE OF QUEEN VICTORIA

GENTLEMEN,—I thank you heartily for electing me to preside over this great national assembly. We meet at the close of a year that will be memorable in the history of the British Empire. We have witnessed and we have taken part in the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of the reign of our Empress. We rejoice with our fellow-subjects of this vast Empire in the prosperity of that reign. We exult in our acquisition of political rights during this period. We bless Her Majesty for her message in 1858 of peace and freedom when the occasion invested it with a peculiar significance. While Englishmen in India inflamed by race animosity and the recollection of the Sepoy Mutiny, which ignorance still calls the Indian Mutiny, were calling for terrible reprisals, she unasked, forgetting and forgiving, issued her gracious proclamation. It was a stern reproof to those who then clamoured for indiscriminate vengeance: it continues to-day a standing rebuke to those of her European subjects who would deny us the right of equal citizenship. She is to us the living embodiment of what is good in British Supremacy, and we may feel assured that her anxiety in our behalf which she manifested in 1858, her kindly regard shown on every subsequent occasion, both in times of joy and of affliction, will continue unabated for the rest of her life. Throughout our land her name is venerated; in almost every language the story of her life has been written and sung, and in years to come her name will rightly find a place in the memory of our descendants along with those great

persons whose virtues have placed them in the ranks of Avatars born into this world for the benefit of this our holy land.

CHARGE OF SEDITION AGAINST EDUCATED INDIANS

Forty years of peace and progress seemed to have amply justified the wise and generous statesmanship of the great Empress, when suddenly this year, we have been startled with the cry of sedition directed not against any specific individual nor even against a number of persons but against a whole class, the product of the liberal policy inaugurated nearly half-a-century ago. The charge of sedition, faintly heard years ago, against the Congress, a charge the absurdity of which has been often exposed, has now been revived against the educated Indians by a section of the Anglo-Indian Press. We are tauntingly asked to study our past history for proof of our degraded condition from which the English Government has raised us, and to contrast it with the blessings we now enjoy. We do not need the invitation. We are acquainted with our immediate past; we feel grateful for the present. But our opponents forget we are more concerned with the progress of our country in the future than with the benefits we have already derived under British Rule.

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

We are well aware of the disordered state of this country when it passed, with its insecurity of person and property, under British Rule, of the enormous difficulties our rulers had to overcome in introducing orderly administration without any help from the then existing agencies. We recognise that the association of the people in the government of the country, except to a very limited extent, was then impossible. We also know that British rule cleared the way to progress and furnished us with the one element, English education, which was necessary to rouse us from the torpor of ages and bring about the religious, social, and political regeneration which the country stands so much in need of. We are also aware that with the decline of British supremacy, we shall

have anarchy, war and rapine. The Mahomedans will try to recover their lost supremacy. The Hindu races and chiefs will fight amongst themselves. The lower castes who have come under the vivifying influence of Western civilisation are scarcely likely to yield without a struggle to the dominion of the higher castes. And we have Russia and France waiting for their opportunities. The ignorant masses may possibly not recognize the gravity of the danger attendant on any decline of England's power in the East. But it is ridiculous to suggest that those who have received the benefit of English education are so shortsighted enough not to see and weigh that danger. While, however, full of gratitude for what Great Britain has done to India—for its Government which secures us from foreign aggression and ensures security of person and property—it should not be forgotten for a moment that the real link that binds us indissolubly to England is the hope, the well founded hope and belief, that with England's help we shall, and, under her guidance alone, we can attain national unity and national freedom. The educational policy of the Government, a policy which combines beneficence with statesmanship, justified such hopes in us. Those hopes were confirmed by various pledges. Those pledges were followed by the creation of institutions by which we were admitted to a share in our ordinary Government which must surely, though slowly, lead to the full fruition of our ambitions.

INDIAN ASPIRATIONS UNDER ENGLAND'S TRAINING

Just look for a moment at the training we are receiving. From our earliest school-days the great English writers have been our classics, Englishmen have been our professors in Colleges. English history is taught us in our schools. The books we generally read are English books, which describe in detail all the forms of English life, give us all the English types of character. Week after week, English newspapers, journals and magazines pour into India for Indian readers. We, in fact, now live the life of the English. Even the English we write shows not only their turns of thought but also their forms

of feeling and thinking. It is impossible under this training not to be penetrated with English ideas, not to acquire English conceptions of duty, of rights, of brotherhood. The study and practice of the law now pursued with such avidity by our people, by familiarising them with reverence for authority and with sentiments of resistance to what is not sanctioned by law, have also materially contributed to the growth of mental independence.

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR INDIA

Imbued with these ideas and principles, we naturally desire to acquire the full rights and to share the responsibilities of British citizenship. We have learnt that in the acquisition of those rights and in the recognition of the principles on which they are based, lie the remedy for the evils affecting our country, evils similar to those from which England herself once suffered. We know that in Great Britain race differences between Norman and Saxon, at one period more virulent than those which at any time existed between Hindu and Mahomedan, religious intolerance which has scarcely been surpassed in India, class divisions equalling any in our own country, a degradation, political and social, of the masses which may be equalled here but could never have been exceeded—all these have disappeared in the common struggle for freedom, and in the combined effort to retain it when acquired, in which each required the help of its antagonist and each was obliged to concede to others the right claimed for itself and which, therefore, resulted in the recognition and solemn affirmation of principles of Government, which obliterated all distinctions of race or religion, caste or class. Those principles affirmed the equality of all before law and Government, the right of Self-Government by the people themselves through their representatives, and complete freedom of speech and discussion as the very breath of national life. It is the hope that one day we may be admitted as equal sharers in this great inheritance, that we shall have all the civil rights associated with the English Government, that we shall be admitted as freely as Englishmen themselves to worship in this temple of freedom—it is

this hope that keeps India and will keep her always attached to the British. This hope is sustained by pledges solemnly made; and the sentiment of loyalty to the British connection created by repeated declarations that we shall be gradually allowed the full rights of English citizenship is already in full force. Such a pledge was made in 1833 when Parliament solemnly declared that race or religion or colour shall not be a disqualification for holding any appointment. This declaration of policy in a time of peace has been solemnly affirmed after the Mutiny. Already, the pledge has been in part redeemed. We have been admitted, as it were, into the outer precincts of the temple of freedom. The Press has been enfranchised. Partially elected members sit in our local and legislative councils. We can enter the Civil Service through the open door of competition. These blessings are no doubt now coupled with conditions which unfortunately detract from their rule. But these great and healthy principles have nurtured and consolidated a sentiment of affection. All that England has to do is to persist resolutely in the line of policy she has initiated and thereby deepen that feeling of loyalty which makes us proud of our connection with England. I myself feel that there is very little reason to fear that England will reverse the past. To deny us the freedom of the Press, to deny us representative institutions, she will have to ignore those very principles for which the noblest names in her history have toiled and bled. She cannot close all her educational institutions in the country. She cannot persuade us not to read the fiery denunciations of every illiberal form of Government, of the petty acts of tyranny committed anywhere on the face of the earth, which appear in her papers imported into India week after week. It is impossible to keep out of India eloquent orations on patriotism by men like Mr. Chamberlain—a Cabinet Minister holding up to admiration the memory of patriots like Wallace, whose head was stuck up on the traitors's gate of the City of London, of Bruce guilty of foul murder in a Church, of Emmet and other Irish leaders executed or hung for treason by the English Government. It is impossible to argue a man into slavery in the English

language. Thus, the only condition requisite for the fruition of our political aspirations is the continuance of the British rule. The fond hope that India may one day take her place in the confederacy of the free English-speaking nations of the world can be realised only under England's guidance with England's help. Years must elapse, it is true, before our expectations can be realised, before we get representative institutions on the models of those of the English-speaking communities. Slavery we had under our old rulers, Hindu and Mahomedan; we may again get it under any despotic European or Asiatic Government. But we know that real freedom is possible only under the Government of the English Nation, nurtured in liberty, hating every form of tyranny, and willing to extend the blessings of representative Government to those capable of using it wisely in the interests of freedom and progress.

WESTERN INFLUENCE ON INDIAN SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS PROGRESS

Great as is the necessity of British Rule for the political emancipation of our country, even greater is the necessity for social and religious reform. In the present circumstances of India, inhabited as it is by followers of various religions, various sects, classes, very often with antagonistic interest, any Government which is not strictly secular and absolutely impartial must be disastrous to the best interests of the country. The customs, institutions, beliefs, practices of one community are denounced by others as unreasonable and destructive of true faith. Some of your reformers, hopeless of any internal reform, building up a new social system have accordingly adopted an attitude so antagonistic to the popular religion that they are regarded as seceders from Hinduism. Others, again, have formed themselves into sects each claiming to be orthodox and denying to others the merit of adherence to the true Hindu religion. We have also preachers in our midst who, while deprecating any revolt or open defiance, urge the purification of the Hindu faith. The gulf between Hinduism and other religions has been considered impassable. But attempts are being made

with some success to re-admit converts into Hinduism. Steps are being taken in some places to mitigate the rancour of religious hostility between Hindus and Mahomedans. Some of the lower castes resent the galling yoke of caste so bitterly that they seek refuge in Mahomedanism or Christianity. The original four castes had multiplied into a number that must appear to every man unreasonable and absurd. There seems to be a general desire to break down the barriers between these numerous castes. Knowledge is accessible to all. The Vedas and other holy books are now common property; equality in knowledge must eventually lead to the practical removal, if not the entire destruction, of the great barriers that now divide the various classes. Again, you are aware of the attempts that are being made to restore our women to the position which competent authorities maintain they occupied in ancient India. We want in brief to eliminate, if necessary, from our system all that stands in the way of progress. We desire to absorb and assimilate into our own what appears good to us in Western civilisation. This is impossible under a Government which would uphold a particular form of religion to the exclusion of others as some of the ancient Governments of India did. To break down the isolation of the Hindu religion, to remove the barriers which now prevent free social intercourse and unity of action, to extend the blessings of education to the lower classes, to improve the position of women to one of equality to men, we require the continuance of a strictly secular Government in thorough sympathy with liberal thought and progress.

INDIAN WITNESSES BEFORE THE WELBY COMMISSION

Gentlemen, I do not propose to refer to the various subjects that we have been continually pressing on the attention of our Government and of the public. This year, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and our four Indian witnesses have stated our grievances before the Welby Commission with a fulness and clearness which leave nothing to be desired. They have stood the test of cross examination by those who have constituted themselves the advocates of Indian

Government, and their evidence will remain on record as a protest against some of the shortcomings of British administration. Our thanks are due to them.

FAMINE AND POVERTY OF INDIA

I shall accordingly content myself with referring to certain notable events of this year. Naturally, the terrible famine that has devastated our country first claims our attention. We render our hearty thanks for the magnificent aid received by us from the people of Great Britain and other countries. We recognise the great sympathy and ability with which the famine administration was carried on in India. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the same energy, if directed to discover and remove the cause of famine, would be of far greater benefit to the country. At the root of these famines is the great poverty of India. The Madras Board of Revenue recently estimated on the returns furnished by local officials with reference to ryotwary tracts, that, in a season described as generally favourable for agricultural operations, there was no grain in the Presidency for five out of a population of 28 millions. If this is true, the miserable state of the people with regard to food-supply in seasons less favourable may be easily conceived. For ourselves, it is unnecessary to rely upon Government estimates and returns. The poverty of the country reveals itself to us in every direction, in every shape and form. It shows itself in the poor condition of the labouring population and of the great majority of ryots who are underfed, and who are without, not only the comforts, but even the absolute necessities of life and who lead a life of penury and toil unredeemed by any hope of provision against the frequent vicissitudes of the seasons, sickness or old age when they must be dependent on relatives or strangers. The once well-to-do ryots are becoming reduced to the position of poor tenants, their poverty preventing them from carrying on any cultivation that requires capital. Parents find it difficult to give their children the education which their profession or station in life demands or, indeed, any education necessary

wherewith to earn their livelihood ; the extreme poverty of the class, to which the majority of students belong, could easily be ascertained. Even a partial failure of crops in one year leads to terrible scarcity or famine. Famine at certain intervals of time is becoming a normal condition of things in India. In 1877, and again this year, the loss of life has been terrible. Each succeeding famine finds the staying power of the masses, particularly in the ryotwary districts, reduced. Is this state of things to continue for ever ? Are we not entitled, are not those who so generously come to our help entitled to ask the responsible Government, whether any steps have been taken to prevent a recurrence of the famine ? In a fertile country, with every variety of clime capable of producing every variety of produce, with a population, thrifty and hardworking, if the produce is not sufficient for the population, it must be due to some defect in the system of administration which does not protect the fruits of industry but scares away capital from the land. If the produce of the country is sufficient for the population and yet as a fact the foodstock remaining in the country does not suffice for consumption, the state of things must be due to some enormous drain on the resources of the country. The feeling is gaining ground, that the Government is morally responsible for the extreme poverty of the masses, for the scarcity that prevails almost every year in some part of the country or other, for the famine that so frequently desolates the land and claims more victims and creates more distress than under any civilized Government anywhere else in the world. The flippancy that would dismiss the entire problem from consideration with the remark that all this is due to over-population and is irremediable is as dangerous as is in the deep-rooted belief that distress is a visitation of Providence for the sins of our rulers. One great Viceroy has had the question under consideration, and to him the remedy in so far as the increase in wealth from the land is concerned was clear. It is permanent settlement of Government Revenue from the land. The settlement officer will not then increase the

revenue and deprive the cultivator of the increased produce due to his labour, or his capital. Labour and capital will then be attracted to the cultivation of the land. There will be a large increase in the agricultural produce in India. There will always be a large reserve of food-stocks in the country available in times of scarcity. The fixity of taxation will create a class of landholders interested in the maintenance of law and order. The policy of Government was once settled in favour of permanency, but in recent years under pressure of, mainly, Military expenditure, the policy has been changed and the revenue enormously raised. Our Government ought to concede the permanent settlement immediately to all parts of India and in those parts of India where from local circumstances a permanent limitation of land revenue is not feasible, it would be a step in the right direction if any increased demand for revenue by Executive action is permitted only with the permission of the Legislative Council. This would not be an adequate remedy, but it is a measure that will help to produce great and satisfactory results.

FOREIGN POLICY AND INDIAN FINANCE

The next remedy that obviously suggests itself has reference to expenditure. Government agencies are notoriously extravagant, at least in the opinion of those who have to find the money, and the foreign policy of the Indian Government imposes a burden on the taxpayer which is already becoming too heavy to bear. The checks that exist are not sufficiently effective. The Budgets at present are only offered for criticism. They ought to be submitted to the Legislative Councils for approval and the members ought to have the power of moving resolutions in connection with them. As the officials always form the majority, Government could never be embarrassed by an adverse vote, whereas in its differences of opinion with the Home Government, a Resolution of the Legislative Council could naturally be a great support to it. The biggest item of expenditure is the Military expenditure. Our true policy is a peaceful policy. We have little if anything to expect from conquests. With such capacity for internal

development as our country possesses, with such crying need to carry out the reforms absolutely necessary for our well-being, we want a period of prolonged peace. We have no complaint against our neighbours, either on our north-west or our north-east frontier. If ever our country is involved in war, it will be due to the policy of aggrandizement of the English Government at London or Calcutta. An Army is maintained at our cost far in excess of what is required for us. The Military element is supreme in the Viceroy's Council. For interests other than Indian, countries are invaded and all the horrors of war let loose at the expense of the Indian taxpayers. As England directs our foreign policy and as wars are undertaken to maintain English Rule, the English Treasury ought to pay the entire cost, claiming contribution from India to the extent of India's interest in the struggle. This would secure a thorough discussion of any foreign policy in the English Parliament. It would also enable Indian Members in the Viceroy's Council to protest against any unfair distribution of the war expenditure when the Budget has to be passed.

EQUALITY OF INDIANS BEFORE LAW AND GOVERNMENT

It is also to be borne in mind that a large portion of this unnecessary expenditure is due to the recognition, not perhaps openly in words, but in acts and policy by Government of the idea that the English are a foreign and superior race holding India by the sword and that the Indians are, as a rule, not worthy of trust and confidence. To us this idea is hateful and, therefore, we insist upon equality before law and Government. We maintain that no distinction ought to be made between classes or races, that the Queen's Proclamation should be adhered to, and, therefore, we protest against the principle underlying the Arms Act whereby no native of India may possess or carry arms without special license while Europeans and Eurasians may bear arms unquestioned. We appeal to our Government to authorize a system of volunteering for Indians and not confine it practically to Europeans and Eurasians, thereby creating and fostering class prejudices. For the same reason we demand that the Military service in its higher

grades should not be restricted to Europeans alone but should be practically opened to the natives of this country, and that Colleges be established for training them for the Military career. On the same ground we press for admission into the Public Service on an equal footing with Europeans. Apart from economic necessity, the stability and permanence of British connection require that not only no positive disqualification should exist but that the rules intended to make the declarations of 1833 and the Queen's promise of 1858 a dead letter must be removed. For the Civil Service, the Police, the Forest Service, the Salt Service, and even the Educational Service, rules are framed apparently on the assumption that a European is by mere reason of his nationality fit and an Indian for the same reason is unfit for the higher appointments in those Services.

THE AIM OF THE CONGRESS

The concession of these demands means an enormous increase in India's defensive strength against any foe ; it means a reduction in taxation which at the rate it is now growing must involve the ruin of the country. These distinctions, on the other hand, cast a slur on our loyalty, accentuate race prejudices on a most invidious form and relegate Indians to the position of an inferior race and silently ensure the emasculation of our manhood. The disastrous consequences of this race question are already apparent. Englishmen and other European colonists in South Africa and Australia refuse to treat us on terms of equality and justify their refusal on account of our degraded position in our own country. On the other hand, a section, I hope a very small section, of our fellow-subjects regards a foreign power of its own religion following a course of policy apparently abhorrent to the conscience of the English Public, with feelings which, though unconsciously, took their origin in the refusal of Englishmen to treat them as fellow-citizens in reality and not merely in name. To this feelings of race superiority is also due the frequent contemptuous treatment of respectable people by soldiers, a treatment which renders

them a terror to peaceful inhabitants and which, according to the confessions apparently believed by Government, has led to the Poona tragedy. The racial feeling I refer to, is confirmed by the belief generally entertained in India, that it is almost impossible to secure the conviction of a European accused of any heinous offence. If that feeling is justified by the action of our authorities, then the position is deplorable. If the impression is unwarranted, then its origin must be due to the idea of inequality before law generally entertained. On this race question no concession is possible. No compromise can be accepted so far as it lies in us. We must insist on perfect equality. Inequality means race inferiority, national abasement. Acquisition, therefore, of all civil rights conferred on Englishmen, removal of all disabilities on Indians as such—these must be our aim.

POONA PLAGUE OPERATIONS

I shall now briefly refer to the Poona plague operations and their unfortunate developments. This country was passing through a terrible ordeal. Poverty which may be said to be the normal condition of our masses deepened into famine. In the Bombay Presidency, it was followed by plague, a terrible disease to which no remedy has yet been discovered. The measures which the Government had to take for its suppression in Poona, which was badly affected, were said to have interfered with the domestic habits of the Hindus and Mahomedans; soldiers who were employed to enforce these Government measures were, rightly or wrongly, generally believed to have insulted women and defiled places of worship. The result was prostration of the people. A feeling of helplessness came over them. In Western countries, the result would have been lawlessness. In Poona, many contented themselves with abandoning their homes. Some resigned themselves to sullen apathy and despair. There were a few who protested against Government measures, pointing out their unnecessary harshness. Amongst those who protested was Mr. Natu, a leading Poona Sardar. His formal written complaints recently published in England disclose, if any

reliance can be placed on them, a state of affairs which certainly demanded attention. Let me give you a brief summary of his complaints.

The inspection of houses by soldiers seems to have been carried out without notice by forcing open, very often unnecessarily when there were other means of entrance, the locks of the shops and the houses when the owners were absent, and absolutely no attempt was made to protect the properties or the house. No notice was taken of complaints concerning them. A Hindu lady was assaulted by a soldier, and Mr. Natu reported the matter to the authorities producing the witnesses. No notice was vouchsafed. The soldiers were refractory, and any complaint against them was obstruction. When a man fell ill, many neighbouring families were taken to the segregation camp and left there without any covering to protect their body or any furniture, their property at home including horses, cows and sheep being left unprotected. A man was unnecessarily taken to the hospital and sent back as not being affected by plague to find his furniture destroyed and his poor wife and relatives forcibly removed and detained in the segregation camp. Temples were defiled by soldiers and his own temple was entered by them on account, Natu believes, of his impertinence in making a complaint. An old man who succeeded in satisfying the search party that he was not suffering from plague was detained in jail some hours for having obstructed the search party, the obstruction apparently consisting in the delay caused by him. Insult was the reward for the services of volunteers, and their suggestions were treated with contumacy. You all know how sensitive our Mahomedan fellow-subjects are about the privacy of their women. And when Mr. Natu suggested that the services of Mahomedan volunteers should be availed of to search the Mahomedan quarter, he was told that his conduct was improper and his services voluntarily rendered were dispensed with. Mr. Natu brought all this to the notice of the officials, pointed out that the operations were carried on against the spirit of the rules and complained that there was a

great amount of unrest. The Indian newspapers gave prominence to these and similar complaints. They compared the English Government to other Governments very much to the disadvantage of the former. The *Mahratta* complained :

Plague is more merciful to us than its human prototypes now reigning in the city.

The tyranny of the Plague Committee and its chosen instruments is yet too brutal to allow respectable people to breathe at ease. And it was added that,

every one of these grievances may be proved to the hilt if His Excellency is pleased to enquire into the details.

These representations were certainly entitled to attentive consideration however much the authorities might have disagreed with them. Their objects were honest, their methods were proper. Their language was not respectful, it was perhaps violent, but men dominated by feelings of distress are often carried beyond what strict prudence would dictate. The violence seems to have been proportionate to the contempt with which the complaints were treated. But to the Indian mind the idea of creating a feeling of disaffection with a view to overthrow the English Government is simply ludicrous. Language which to a lawyer savoured perhaps of sedition was only intended by its violence to attract attention, and such language was only caused by the bitter feeling, that milder representations by a race not so law-abiding as the Indians would have received immediate and careful attention. However, while these plague operations were being carried out, the President of the Plague Committee, to the horror and alarm of the native community, was murdered on what happened to be the Jubilee celebration day. To the Indian mind it was clear that this was nothing more than an unfortunate coincidence.

ENGLISH IGNORANCE OF THE NATIVE FEELING

But its effect was very different in certain quarters. An Englishman in India is in a strange world; with his energy, practical will and idea of freedom, he fails to understand and perhaps despises a nation given up to

metaphysical dreams which does not regard material prosperity as the great object of life. In other parts of the world under European sway, in Africa and America an alliance with a European is eagerly sought, while in India where also he is master, he is regarded by the castes as impure whose touch is pollution. With such differences in thought and feeling, no wonder that ordinary Englishmen ignore the people entirely and do not try to understand them. Hence their limited comprehension. Not knowing the native mind they exaggerate the importance of trifles which only ruffle the surface of native feeling, and attribute to certain events a significance which however justifiable in England do not even deserve a passing notice in India. The difficulties of English administration based on this misunderstanding are increased by misrepresentations. Labouring under this incapacity to discover the mental condition of the Indian masses, the Anglo-Indian papers are not generally safeguards. In times of excitement, in particular, some of them prove positively mischievous.

DEPORTATION OF NATU BROTHERS

Thus, it is not a matter for surprise that a section of the Anglo-Indian Press discovered a deep design in the Poona murder. They found a pretext for the murder in the plague measures taken by Government. That the Native Press denounced such measures confirmed their suspicion. That the murder took place on the day of a great world-wide rejoicing proved to their satisfaction a deep-laid conspiracy which could have been planned only by educated cunning. Almost every incident that took place in Poona was pressed into the service to support this theory of conspiracy, and an attack was commenced on the Vernacular Press and the educated Indians, perhaps unexampled in its virulence since the Mutiny; a Gagging Act was loudly demanded, the policy of imparting education to the Indians was questioned, the Press in England was worked, and the Europeans were thrown into a panic. The attack on the educated Indians and the Vernacular Press was brutal and cowardly. It was suggested as a matter for regret that the

native mind had forgotten the lessons of the last Mutiny, that a fresh Mutiny would clear the air, particularly as the Mahrattas were not in the show of 1857. It was insisted that the Native Press was seditious and was responsible for the murder, and a section of the Anglo-Indian Press demanded the punishment by name, of Mr. Tilak, the man who had strongly attacked and denounced the measures of Government. The unreasoning panic into which the Anglo-Indian community was driven by this malignant attack, and its unfortunate success in inflaming the English Public, forced, according to the English papers, the hands of the Secretary of State, and Lord Sandhurst had to take measures which, it is believed, he would never have sanctioned if he had remained a free agent. Ostensibly to discover the murderer, but acting on the theory that the murders were the result of a conspiracy for which the Vernacular Press was responsible, the Government arrested the Natu brothers under the provisions of an old law intended for lawless times to secure the peace of the country. Mr. Tilak and the Editors of two Vernacular papers were prosecuted; and a Punitive Force was imposed on the Poona Municipality. The arrest of the Natu brothers was and must remain a great blunder. It recalls the worst days of irresponsible despotism. Liberty of person and property is a farce if you are liable to be arrested, imprisoned, and your property sequestered at the will and pleasure of Government without being brought to trial. We shall before we part, I have no doubt, express our emphatic protest against this proceeding.

IMPRISONMENT OF MR. TILAK

The Editor of one of the papers was tried by a Judge without a Jury, and was convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment which can be explained only by the panic which seized the entire European community. Mr. Tilak was tried by a Judge and Jury. A European,—he need not even be a subject of the Empress,—may claim to be tried by a Jury of whom at least one-half shall be Europeans. This is practically an efficient protection not only against the Executive but against popular

excitement. In the case of an Indian, the entire Anglo-Indian community may be most unreasonably and passionately prejudiced against him; he may be an object of violent antipathy to the other races; yet he cannot claim fair trial at the hands of his countrymen. He must submit to be quietly convicted after, it may be, the farce of a trial; for a trial seldom restrains men who are passionately excited, and the Trial by Jury, an institution intended for the protection of the prisoner in such circumstances, proves a delusion and a snare by depriving the prisoner of the right of appeal. Mr. Tilak, there can be scarcely any doubt, would have claimed a Trial by a Jury of whom one half were Indians, if to the Indians the law allowed the same protection that it affords to the European. If there is any offence in India which ought to be tried by a Native Jury, it is the offence of sedition. It was possible that a Native Jury, who knew the language and who were in a more favourable position to form a correct judgment of the probable and intended effect of the articles on native mind, would not have convicted; it was certain that a European Jury in that state of public excitement would convict. By exercising its right of challenge, the prosecution was able to secure a Jury of six Europeans—the number necessary to secure a conviction—and three Indians, and the verdict was naturally 6 to 3. In a far stronger case tried by an experienced Chief Justice, who had been trained in English Courts, and retained the instincts of an Englishman, the Judge refused to accept the verdict of 7 to 2, when there was only one native on the Jury. In prison these men after conviction have been treated as ordinary criminals. You are perhaps aware that, in England, a man convicted of sedition is not treated as an ordinary criminal, sedition being regarded as a political offence, but in India apparently one is subject to the ordinary hardships of prison life.

SAFEGUARDING POPULAR RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

This Poona incident enforces the necessity of ceaseless vigilance in keeping the English public correctly

informed of whatever passes in India and of thus counteracting the mischievous effects of the dissemination of incorrect news. It emphasises the necessity of extending the system of Trial by Jury to India on the same conditions as it is granted to Europeans. It also shows that the Executive Government can deprive us of our liberty of person and property at its own will and pleasure. It has brought into disagreeable prominence the unsatisfactory nature of the law of sedition. The Government of India have announced their intention to alter such law in the light of recent events. We trust the Government will bear in mind that in the circumstances of this country, anything which checks freedom of public discussion is most deplorable. Such check may become a temporary, if dangerous, bar to quiet and steady progress. The stream of our national progress will nevertheless move on. It will become dry only when our holy rivers of India become dry. Its progress at present under sympathetic guidance is smooth. Its unwise obstruction may compel underground passages or its overflow. It is a sad commentary on a century of British Rule that a Vernacular paper has had to close its office with these words :

It is no more now-a-days safe to conduct newspapers ; hence we, who have other means of livelihood to support us, make our exit and do not feel any more necessity of attending the Deputy Commissioner's Bungalow to offer explanations for certain writings.

RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

Though the Press prosecutions are over, the Government has answered the question that will be asked by posterity, and that is being asked by India now. Was there any foundation for the complaints made by these various men, some of them honorably distinguished ? Why have they been led to commit those acts which have now been declared to be offences ? If they are not justified, if they cannot prove their allegations, they cannot be condemned too strongly ; they will then have proved a curse to our country for the mischief they have committed. If, on the other hand, it was a righteous indignation for the

sufferings of their countrymen that led them to jail, it will be difficult to blame those who extend their sympathy to them.

VIOLENT CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT MEASURES

We deprecate most strongly any intemperate language in criticizing Government measures. We are bound to assume that any objectionable measure must have been due either to ignorance or to error of judgment. We have also to remember that after all our salvation lies in bringing home to the majority of the people of England our real wishes and feelings and that the persons whose actions are criticised are their own kith and kin, that the system of Government we attack was framed by men for whom they feel just respect and esteem. Any violence therefore will do us infinite harm, it may possibly prevent us from securing a hearing. A false, incorrect, or even doubtful allegation will discredit us in the eyes of Englishmen, and the cause of reform may be thereby put back for generations.

INDIA'S LOYALTY TO THE BRITISH THRONE

Let me say at once that in the remarks I make I deem it superfluous to proclaim our loyalty to the British Throne or Constitution, or to add that we have not the slightest sympathy with any speech or writing which would regard a severance of our connection as a desirable consummation. We naturally take a pride in the lives of the great men who have lived for India, and we would draw the attention of our rulers to that part of our ancient history which we think they might usefully study. But we are also aware that the present has its roots in the past, and the past is responsible for our lowly condition. We who claim equality at the hands of Englishmen would deplore and resist any attempt to revive the days when any caste or class as such was privileged before the law, when a Brahmin, for instance, could claim immunity from punishment! We claim equality for all, Brahmins and Pariahs alike. It is this same feeling that prompts our criticism of any act on the part of our Rulers which may

..

seem to recognise any inequality. It is by the removal of these inequalities before law between European and Indian, and by the degree of Self-Government conceded to us that we measure our progress towards freedom.

INDIA'S POLITICAL FUTURE

Gentlemen, I have done. I am afraid I have wearied you with my lengthy remarks, but I hope I have succeeded in placing before you clearly some points relating to our present political condition. We have no need to despair of our political future so long as we depend upon Great Britain, but let us at the same time be alive to our duties and responsibilities. India expects great things from us, the whole civilised world is watching the changes coming over us. Shall we be content to leave India as it is, or shall we go on and do all in our power to lift it to a higher level. Years of subjection, nay, we may even say servitude, have sapped the strength of the Indian Nation, dwarfed its growth, and stripped it of all that was grand and noble in it, and if India is ever to occupy a better position than she fills at the present moment and take her proper place in the scale of nations, it must be entirely due to the zealous efforts of her educated and enlightened sons. Let *nil desperandum* be our motto; let not 'insidious smile or angry frown' deter us from following the straight path of duty; and with the welfare and progress of our land as our end and aim, let us endeavour under a solemn sense of responsibility, as well as loyalty to our country, to bring about that glorious future which must inevitably crown our efforts.

MR. A. M. BOSE

INTRODUCTION

BROTHER-DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—When the heart is full, fewest and simplest words are the best. Let me, therefore, only say I thank you most sincerely for the honour you have done me by electing me as your President—one so unworthy of the honour, so conscious of his deficiencies. Permit me to ask for your good wishes that I may not wholly fail to discharge the arduous duties to which your voice has called me, that still not fully recovered from the effects of a recent illness, strength may be given me to be not wholly inadequate to the responsibilities that devolve on me. It is to your indulgence, to your kindness and your sympathy, that I look for that help which I need to enable me to preside over your deliberations in the Session now opening before us, and I am sure I do not ask for this in vain.

MR. GLADSTONE

Brother-Delegates, as I rise to address you, my thought goes to that dear land with which it has pleased Providence in its kindness to link the destinies of this great and ancient country. Ladies and Gentlemen, this I believe is the first meeting of the Congress, since its birth, from which no message of congratulation on his returning birthday will go to the great Englishman—the greatest of his age—whose earthly career came to its end on the Ascension Day of the year now about to close. On every 28th of December, as it came back, it was the privilege of the President of the Indian National Congress to ask for your authority—and that authority was given, with glad enthusiasm—to send a telegram conveying our best wishes to

Mr. Gladstone. That privilege will not be mine. That duty henceforth will remain unperformed. That saintly statesman to whom—as to Savonarola of old, the fourth centenary of whose martyrdom too falls on this year—politics was a part of his religion; the Christian warrior who fought the fight of freedom for England, and not for England alone; whom Bulgaria and Greece, whom Armenia and Italy, even distant India, mourns no less than his own country; the friend of the weak and the helpless in whatever tongues their wails might be uttered; the bravest of the brave in every good cause, however hopeless, as Lord Rosebery described him in that oration in the House of Lords which will live, has gone to his rest amid the tears of a united nation. Never was the strife of parties so hushed, the deepest love of the country so drawn, its noblest feelings so stirred, as when that great soul departed this life. “In the use of all his gifts,” said the Archbishop of Canterbury at St. Paul’s, “there was ever the high purpose, ever the determination to the utmost of his knowledge and power to obey the law of God.” It was my privilege to visit in humble reverence the room in Liverpool where Mr. Gladstone first saw the light: there I lived for a few days opposite to that room as the guest of one of the dearest friends I made in England. It was my privilege to stand beside his grave in the Abbey which is the last resting place of the greatest of that land, and to take part with Englishmen of all parties in many demonstrations in his honor. And if it is not my privilege to-day, standing in this place to send an earthly wire to Mr. Gladstone, let us all in this great gathering—the greatest and the highest that educated India knows—with bowed heads, take to heart his great memory, cherish with affection the lessons of his noble life, and send our spirit’s greetings of love and reverence to him in that world which he has now entered, and where perchance affection’s messages are not wholly lost.

THE NEW VICEROY}

Ladies and Gentlemen, I should have liked to dwell on some of the lessons of that life—lessons of special

import to us, and not to us only but to those also in whose hands God has entrusted the government of this country, and the fate for weal or woe of its vast population. But from the great Englishman who has passed away, let us turn to another Englishman—the greatest by virtue of his position during his stay amongst us, the august representative of our Beloved Sovereign—who to-morrow will land on India's shores. I am sure, Brother-Delegates, I give expression to your unanimous feeling when, on your behalf, I tender our cordial welcome to Lord Curzon. There is no higher wish I can express for him than that, when the time comes for him to step down from his exalted office, he may carry with him from the people of this country some portion of that blessing and that love which have followed Mr. Gladstone on quitting the scene of his earthly labours from many nations and many lands, that he may find a place in their hearts by the justice and the righteousness of his rule, and reign there when the external emblems and pomp of power—how temporary after all—will have been laid aside. I know of no higher or more unique responsibility than that which appertains to the office of the Viceroy of India, called upon to bear the burden of guiding the destinies for happiness or misery of nearly three hundred millions of fellow-beings in a distant and an unfamiliar land—a responsibility which might tax the energies and try the powers of the most gifted and the most capable of men, which requires for its fulfilment the highest qualities not only of the head, but also of the heart; the precious gift of sympathy with those who have no vote or voice, the divine gift of the insight of the spirit which can see, can enter into and realize the feelings of an unfamiliar people, no less than the cool head and the sober informed judgment, the administrative skill and ripe experience. His Lordship's recent utterances fill us with hope. To exhibit British Power inspired by the ideal of Christ, based therefore, may we not say, on the Law of Love and the Golden Rule, to treat the men of the East as if they were of like composition with the men of the West, to be fired with sympathy with all races, creeds and classes of Her Majesty's subjects, is, indeed, a basis of

statesmanship and a standard of success worthy of the high office to which His Lordship has been called. May He Who is the Common Father of us all, and to Whom all nations are as one, give to our coming Viceroy strength and guidance and grace to carry out this ideal and fulfil these hopes! To Lord Curzon will fall the honor of carrying for the first time the British Administration of a United India to a New Century. May that Century open in sunshine and brightness and hope, free from the shadows which linger over the land not only from the calamities of Nature, but also from the weaknesses of man!

AN ERA OF DOMESTIC REFORM

The new Viceroy will take charge of affairs at a time not devoid of anxiety. I will not refer here to questions of Frontier Policy. They have been discussed during the year both in England and India. Lord Curzon has been credited with "advanced" views on the Frontier questions. But as the result of that discussion by the light of further experience since the statesmanlike policy of Lord Lawrence and the distinguished men who followed him has been reversed, and on a nearer study of the financial and other urgent and pressing needs of the Empire entrusted to his care, all India, irrespective of creed or nationality, ventures earnestly to hope that His Lordship will direct his great capacity and his great energy to initiating an era of domestic reform, of educational progress and industrial development, and leave a contented, prosperous and progressive India with its countless millions, as the best bulwark and the strongest defence, yea, as an invulnerable barrier against any foreign foe who may be misguided enough to assail India's peace or threaten India's frontier.

A VITAL PROBLEM

But if I will not refer to questions of External Policy, as such, and except in their relation to questions of domestic progress, let me refer to an unhappy and, if not checked, even disastrous, tendency which has within the last few years manifested itself in regard to questions of

Internal Policy and which deserves far more attention than it has yet received. So vitally important to the welfare of India and to the honor and interest of England do I consider this matter to be, so essential to the clearing of misapprehensions and to mutual understanding, to the restoration and growth of that feeling of sympathy, love and confidence, between the rulers and the ruled, which is the basis of good government, that with your permission, Brother-Delegates, I shall make this my main theme to-day, and devote the principal part of the time at my disposal to an examination of the facts which shew the existence of this tendency and its vigorous growth, of the consequences, of its existence, of its remedy, and some subjects intimately connected with it. In the present crisis I feel, and I am sure you will agree with me, we cannot attempt to do a greater service alike to the Government and to the people, greater service to the cause of good administration, than to draw attention to this important problem.

THE DARK TIDE OF REACTION

Ladies and Gentlemen, it has sometimes been a question in the past, as no doubt it will sometimes be in the future, as to the rate of progress in the concession of the elementary rights of citizenship to the people of this country. But slow and cautious, to many minds even too tardy, as the advance has been, an advance once made has never been retracted, a concession to freedom once granted has never been withdrawn; progress and not retrogression, growing confidence and not unworthy reaction, nearer approach and not wider separation, attempt at fulfilment of pledges solemnly and sacredly given and not their practical cancellation, has been so long the usual order of things in the British administration of this country. This is the foundation on which all the best statesmen of the past, all the noblest Englishmen whose privilege it has been to take part in the government of the country, and of whose memory England is proud to-day, have built up the splendid fabric of the Indian Empire. Once, indeed, exactly twenty years ago, a reactionary piece of legislation found its way into the Statute Book. I refer, I need

hardly say, to the Vernacular Press Act of Lord Lytton. But the potent voice of the great English people made itself heard, and it was not allowed long to stay there. It was soon withdrawn, and the speedy reversal of that retrograde legislation served only still more to emphasize and to confirm the permanent policy of steady advance to which I have referred, a policy so worthy of the honor, of the glorious tradition and the best interests of the country with which Providence has linked our fate. Some of us fought in the dark days of that happily temporary period of reaction; and I vividly remember the perils and the difficulties amid which we fought. Let me ask you, Brother-Delegates, to take to heart the augury afforded by that reversal and to feel assured that if only we are earnest, if only we do our duty and labour on and faint not, the innate sense of justice of the British people will not long allow the darker tide of the present day to roll on.

I have charged the Government with reaction, with reversing the wise and beneficent policy of the past. I confess it is a heavy indictment to bring. I should be happy indeed—none happier—if I could think or find that I am mistaken in the view I have taken. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, I cannot shut from my view stubborn facts which crowd around me. Let me place before you a few of these facts—they are only a sample—taken from the history of the last two years in proof of this charge, which it is no pleasure, but deep pain to bring.

RE-ORGANIZATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICE

The first perhaps in point of time is what is euphemistically known as the "Re-organization of the Educational Services in India", contained in the Resolution of the Government of India in the Home Department, dated the 23rd July 1896, but which came into effect later on. I cannot enter into the details of the matter, but let me briefly present the salient features of the situation. The dates I shall give relate to Bengal. Probably the same dates apply to the other provinces also. There are three

stages in the history of this matter shewing the course of the backward march. The first was when the higher Educational Service of the country was organized and the Graded System introduced, now a little more than thirty years ago. The gracious promises and the noble words of Her Majesty the Queen on the assumption of the direct Government of India, which will ever live in our hearts and will form the charter of our rights, were then fresh in the people's minds and had not been forgotten; and to the highest grades of that Educational Service, natives of India were then admitted on exactly the same footing as their English fellow-subjects. There was no difference either in position or in pay based on race or nationality, but merit had an equal recognition in whomsoever of the Queen's subject, Indian or English, it was found. This policy of the "Open Door" was not merely on paper and in profession, but was invariably carried out, a great many natives of India actually rising to the highest and other grades in the Service, and receiving the same pay as their English brethren in those grades. Then came the second stage. This in Bengal was about twenty years ago. The highest appointments in the Education Department still remained, as of old, freely open to the natives of India, but it was ruled that they were to receive only two-thirds of the pay of their English colleagues doing the same work. And now, in 1896, came the last stage of all. The status of Indian Members in the higher ranks was still further lowered, their pay was still further reduced from two-thirds to virtually one-half of their English colleagues; and sadder still they were now for the first time excluded from certain of the higher appointments in the Department. In Bengal, for instance, Principalships of five of the leading Colleges, besides several other appointments, are henceforth to be reserved for members of what is to be known as the "Indian Service", so called apparently because under the new Scheme there are practically to be no Indians in that Service. There is the word "usually" in the sentence which restricts natives of India to the Provincial Service; but as we know, in spite of every effort and repeated application, no Indian has yet been appointed

by the Secretary of State in England. Natives of India, educated in the highest Universities of England, possessing the same or even much higher qualifications than their English colleagues, of the same standing and doing the same work with them, are to get half or less than half of the pay of the latter, are to be excluded from the higher positions open to the latter, and may have to serve as their subordinates. I ask you, Brother-Delegates, is a new barrier now to be erected against the people of this country? Is a new policy of reservation and exclusion based on considerations of race and colour to be now inaugurated in India after sixty years of Her Gracious Majesty's beneficent reign? Is the stream of liberty for the people of India to be a broadening, widening, deepening stream, or is it to be a narrowing, dwindling, vanishing channel, like some sacred rivers of old lost in the sand? Is this the way in which effect is to be given to the gracious promises of our noble Queen, to the solemn pledges of the British Parliament, the repeated assurances of our Rulers? The worst of it is that so far as we can judge from the Resolution—and it is a lengthy document—this aspect of the question does not appear to have been even considered by the Government of India. To tell you the truth, I would give a great deal to have the opportunity of a face-to-face discussion with the authors of the Scheme. So indefensible is the measure, and so strong are the facts of the case. May we not hope that Lord Curzon will some day find time to look into the matter for himself, and redress the wrong that has been perpetrated.

EXCLUSION FROM ROORKEE

My next sample will also relate to matters educational. I purposely select them, for they, at any rate, cannot have any mysterious political reasons to influence their decision. Will it be believed—a distinguished Anglo-Indian gentleman before whom I mentioned it in England would not believe it—that the privilege of admission to the Engineering Class at Roorkee, the most important in India and of competition for its appointments, which was freely open to all Statutory Natives of India till the year 1896, is

no longer so open. From the year which of all others ought to have been the gladdest of years to us—the year to which we had looked forward with longing hope for fresh privileges and added rights—the year of Her Gracious Majesty's Diamond Jubilee—from that year this privilege has been withdrawn from “natives of pure Asiatic descent, whose parents or guardians are domiciled in Bengal, Madras and Bombay”. I cannot congratulate the Government on this further carrying out of the policy of exclusion, of the policy of creating new barriers, of the shutting in of the “Open Door”. But it seems there is to be wheel within wheel, exception within exception. It is only the pure natives of India of the provinces named who are to be shut out. Children of European or Eurasian parents, settled and domiciled in those provinces, may enjoy all the privileges as of old. They will continue to have the appointments from the Roorkee College still open to them, to have the advantage of selecting whichever Engineering College in India they like for their education. It is no wonder, perhaps, that I should have heard motives ascribed for a proceeding so extraordinary as this. I will not repeat them, I cannot and do not believe them. But allow me to point out that here before our very eyes, is the creation of a new disqualification founded on considerations of race. If this is not a reversal of the policy of the past which recognised no distinction of race, colour or creed, at any rate at Roorkee, will any of our Anglo-Indian friends kindly tell us what reversal means; and if this is not going backward, then what the definition of that process may be? May we respectfully ask how long is this process to continue? Is a *ukase* to issue shutting, say, the doors of the Presidency College or the University at Calcutta against the people of the N.-W. Provinces or the Punjab, against the students of Madras or of Bombay, on the ground that they have Universities of their own? Or, why confine ourselves to India? I could sooner imagine my sinking to the bowels of the earth than of my own University of Cambridge, or of my own College of Christ's with its bright memories of kindness which I can never forget, shutting its doors or refusing its prizes to the

natives of India, even though they be guilty of the crime of being of "pure Asiatic descent". The Bombay Presidency Association, the Indian Association of Calcutta, and, I believe, other Associations sent Memorials to the Government of India against this exclusion, rendered not more palatable or more justifiable by reason of its invidious character; but to no avail. The Government see no reason, the memorialists are informed only in July last, "at present to re-open the matter". May we be permitted to think that in the words "at present" there is some door yet left for hope.

IMPRISONMENT IN BRITISH INDIA WITHOUT TRIAL

Let me now come to the matter of the Natu Brothers, two prominent citizens of Poona, imprisoned without trial, detained in jail without charge, without even any knowledge on their part as to what they were suspected of having done, in spite of repeated requests for such information, denied all access to their legal advisers, deprived of their liberty for an indefinite period, depending on the pleasure of the authorities by virtue of an administrative or executive order. Is it necessary to point out that imprisonment without trial is repugnant to the most elementary principles of British Justice? Into the melancholy history of the shifting accounts which were allowed to leak out as to what these unfortunate people were suspected to have done, it is not necessary for me to enter into any detail. Suffice it to say that we were first told on high authority, that the result of their arrest would be to unravel a plot. Nearly eighteen months have passed. May we ask if that plot has yet been unravelled and what the particular plot was? We have not the slightest sympathy with the Natus if they have done anything wrong. But the plot theory by the stern logic of facts had soon to be given up. We were then told on the same high authority that one or both of the Natus, it is not quite clear which was meant, had been guilty of playing some "tricks". He or they had threatened a midwife by writing a letter to her, and had attempted to corrupt or

pervert a Policeman. The most diligent inquiry has hitherto failed to elicit any information as to who this threatened midwife and this incorruptible Policeman could be, or anything as to this mysterious letter and writing. Is it necessary to mention the famous Pigott case to show the danger of an *ex parte* investigation—if indeed there has been any investigation at all in the present case—even when it is conducted with the highest skill and the greatest sense of responsibility? What the next version of this affair may be we cannot yet say. If indeed no trial could be held, if indeed there be no provision for these “tricks” in our Penal Code, the most drastic in the world, the most easily changeable at the will, and to suit the will of the authorities as we know to our cost, is there any reason why there could not at least be a departmental inquiry in the presence of the victims of this arbitrary order in which they could be told of their offence, confronted with their now anonymous accusers, and asked for their defence? Englishmen point, and justly point, the finger of scorn at Russia for her arrests by administrative order and detentions without trial. I presume these are authorised by the laws of that land. Whole England, irrespective of party or class, yea, the whole civilized world outside France, has denounced in the strongest terms the condemnation of Dreyfus; because though he knew what the charges were which he had to meet, though he was put on his trial and defended by counsel, though witnesses against him were examined in his presence and cross-examined by that counsel, though he had every opportunity to put forward his defence, yet there was one document shewn to his Judges who condemned him, which was not shewn to his advocate—and that on the ground that the divulging of that document was fraught, in the opinion of the responsible Ministers of France, with grave political danger to the country, involving the risk of war with a neighbouring Power. I will not pause, Ladies and Gentlemen, to compare and to present in sad contrast the circumstances of that case which has been so universally denounced by all Englishmen with the circumstances of the case of the Natus.

It may be said, I have heard it said, that after all it is a question affecting two men out of the many millions of India with regard to whom Government may possibly have made a mistake; and this need not have any disturbing effect. Are they who say this aware, is the Government aware, of the sense of insecurity, of the breach in that sense of absolute confidence in the majesty of law and the security of person which is the greatest glory and the noblest bulwark of British Rule, yea, of the unmanning and even terrorizing influence over many minds, produced by these proceedings? Whose turn will come next, on whom and at what moment may this sword of Damocles fall, is a question which has been asked by many amongst not the least notable of our land. I am glad, however, Ladies and Gentlemen, to inform you that the humble individual who is now addressing you has an unknown Lancashire working-man protector for himself. I may tell you the little story. The incident may interest you, as it interested and even touched me at the time. At the conclusion of a meeting, I think it was at Oldham, in which I had taken part, several of the audience came up to speak to me; and I happened to mention that should it please the Government so to act, which I trusted it would not, there was nothing to prevent their dealing with me on my return to India as they had dealt with the Natus. I shall not easily forget the scene that followed. One of my hearers, a working-man I believe, with indignation and excitement depicted on his face, told me: "We know you, Sir. Should the Government treat you in this way, Lancashire men will know the reason why." I am sorry to say, Ladies and Gentlemen, I forgot to ask his name or to note down his address. But, as I told him, I trust his interference on my behalf will not be needed.

THE NEW LAW OF SEDITION

I shall not dwell on the next sample I have to present of the reactionary policy of the last two years—the recent amendments in the Law of Sedition and in the Criminal Procedure Code. These will, no doubt, form the subject of a Specific Resolution to be submitted at the Congress.

Let me only observe in passing that to make more Draconian a law which, in every case in which it had been tried of late, had proved only too effective, and to class speakers on public platforms and editors of papers with rogues and vagabonds and notorious bad characters who are liable to be called upon to furnish security for good behaviour, and to be sent in default to jail, is not the part of wisdom or statesmanship; that to add to the Judicial powers of the Executive officers of the Government, instead of curtailing and withdrawing them, is sinning against the light, is proceeding against a principle which had obtained the fullest recognition in the highest quarters, including the two last Secretaries of State for India, Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross. Cases of alleged sedition, so long triable only by a purely Judicial officer with the help of Jury or Assessors, may now, for the first time in the history of British India, be tried by the District Magistrate who is the head of the Police, and Head Executive or Administrative officer of the Government in the District, and that too without such help. Is it any wonder that a measure, whose character I have but briefly indicated above, has met with an amount of opposition, irrespective of race or party, in India and out of India—and perhaps in this connection I may be permitted specially to mention the name of Mr. Maclean, the Conservative Member of Cardiff—which, I believe, is absolutely unique in the history of Indian Legislation?

OTHER REACTIONARY MEASURES

Brother-Delegates, I might go on with the story of reaction—it has been a plentiful crop in these two years—but I will not do so, I will not dwell on the story of the imposition of a Punitive Police Force on a whole city, impoverished and plague-stricken, for the guilt of one man; of the series of Press Prosecutions; of the institution of that new thing in India known, I believe, as Press Committees, whose history our friend Mr. Chambers, whom we welcome here to-day, so eloquently told before many English audiences; of the many repressive provisions, euphemistically called amendments, introduced

in recent legislative enactments, and of many other matters which will readily occur to your minds.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL

But permit me to take up a little of your time by referring to a measure of retrogression which is still on the legislative anvil. I mean the Calcutta Municipal Bill. I do so to illustrate how the tide of reaction of which I have spoken is still flowing, and I do so because though this is a local measure, if it is carried, if the metropolis of India is deprived of the power of Local Self-Government which it has enjoyed so long and with such marked success, a precedent will have been created—and a blow will have been struck at a cause on which rest all hopes of India's future progress—the effect of which will be felt far and wide. The privilege of Municipal Self-Government, of control by the ratepayers over Municipal administration through their elected representatives which Calcutta now enjoys and has enjoyed for more than twenty years, was granted under Conservative auspices. Sir Richard Temple—a name remembered with gratitude in Bengal—who was our ruler then, and who resigned a Governorship to become a Conservative Member of Parliament, was its author, and the present Prime Minister of England was the Secretary of State for India at the time. The great and numerous improvements carried out by the Corporation, and the zeal and devotion of the Commissioners have been acknowledged by the Government time after time in Official Resolutions, and in other ways. If there are any insanitary conditions, there is the amplest power in the hands of the Government under the existing law, and expressly introduced in that behalf, to cause their removal. And yet it is now proposed to make a radical and a revolutionary change in the law, to deprive the Corporation of almost every real power and to vest it in a Chairman, who is an official and a nominee of the Government, and a Committee in which the ratepayers will be represented by a mere third of its members. I venture to hope that the popular and esteemed Ruler of Bengal, who is not responsible for the introduction of the

present Bill, will yet see his way at least to largely modify, if not to withdraw, this revolutionary proposal, and not allow his name to be associated with a scheme which makes not for progress, but for retrogression, which will undo the work of the past, fatally arrest the hopeful and promising growth of civil life, destroy the very principle of Local Self-Government, weaken and impair the cause of Municipal Administration, and leave memories of bitterness behind. And may I not in this connection make a very special appeal to our coming Viceroy? He comes out to India as the representative of an Administration whose most glorious and memorable achievement—an achievement which will live in the golden pages of history and shed lustre on that Administration—has been the granting of Local Self-Government to the people of Ireland, granting it amid many difficulties and against much opposition, and at the very time when faction fights and armed conflicts were going on in the streets of Belfast. And indeed so convinced were the Government of the need for this liberal measure of Self-Government as a cure for the evils which afflict that country, and for the growth of a healthy public life, that they did not hesitate to make a munificent grant of, I believe, about seven-hundred-thousand pounds, or more than a crore of rupees, *per annum* to Ireland from the Imperial Treasury, to enable the provisions of this measure to be carried out properly, and without friction or jar amongst conflicting interests and classes of the community. We ask for no funds. We ask for no extension of Calcutta's Municipal rights. But we implore that the rights, circumscribed and safeguarded as they are, which have so long been enjoyed, may not be taken away. Is that too much to ask? Too much even to ask, let at least an inquiry be held, a representative Commission be appointed and the Corporation heard in its defence, before this blow is struck and a dearly cherished right which was granted in 1876 which, after experience of its working and full discussion of its merits, was confirmed in 1888, may not now be suddenly snatched away from a subject and a patient population?

IMPOLICY OF WITHDRAWING PRIVILEGES ONCE GRANTED

Brother-Delegates, I have been urging the unwisdom of a retrograde policy, of a policy of withdrawing concessions and privileges once granted. The proposition is so obvious that I do not know that any authorities are needed in support of it. Yet I will quote one, and I will select that one, because it will answer a double purpose. Sir Douglas Straight, as we all know, was an eminent Judge of the Allahabad High Court. And, perhaps, he is even better known in England than in India, and is, I believe, the Editor of one of the most influential and powerful organs of Conservative opinion in England. Writing to the *Times*, he said as follows :

Speaking from thirteen years' residence in India, during which, I hope, I kept neither my eyes nor ears shut, I am firmly convinced of one thing, and it is this—that while innovations and changes there should only be very gradually and cautiously introduced, a concession once made should never be—

it is a strong Conservative you see who is writing—

withdrawn, except for reasons of the most paramount and pressing emergency.

Ladies and Gentlemen, no comments of mine are needed on this passage. I said I have selected this for a double purpose. I will explain what I mean. I have already referred to the one instance of retrograde legislation in the past before the present wave of action set in, and to the early and unlamented fate that overtook it. The passage which I have quoted was written in connection with the one instance of Administrative proceeding of a retrograde character in the past that I can call to mind in my Province—a proceeding which, too, like its legislative predecessor, was before long withdrawn. Six years ago the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, with the previous sanction, and it would seem, at the instance of the Government of India, issued a Notification seriously curtailing the very limited concession of Trial by Jury which Bengal had previously enjoyed. As usual, all this was matured in the dark, without giving any opportunity to the people vitally concerned to know anything, or to be heard or make any

representation in regard to the matter. And the Government of India, with contemptuous indifference to the opinions and feelings of the people of India, set about to take steps for enlarging the area of retrogression for curtailing and withdrawing the privilege of Trial by Jury from some other provinces also. In fact, I believe the Notification in regard to the province of Assam had already been issued before the course of the Government was arrested. But happily the agitation that followed on the promulgation of the other reached the shores of England; and it was on that occasion, strongly condemning this order, that Sir Douglas Straight wrote to the *Times*. I will quote one more passage from the letter. Referring to the Jury Notification, he observes :

It would be absurd to suppose that the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal cannot make a plausible case in support of his new departure; but the question to my mind is not so much whether the operation of the Jury system has exhibited some defects, as whether the mischief likely to result from its continuance promised to be so grave as to make it his imperative duty to intervene.

It only remains for me, Ladies and Gentlemen, to state the happy conclusion. At the instance of the Secretary of State, a Commission was appointed to inquire into the matter; and as the result of that enquiry, the "plausible case" set up by the Government of Bengal and which had met with the approval of the Government of India—alas! how easily can plausible cases be set up, specially when they are one-sided productions—was completely brushed aside and Indian opinion completely vindicated. And in consequence of the Report of that Commission, the Jury Notification was withdrawn by the Government, which had issued it, and the Jury system which had been threatened with extinction has now instead been further extended in the Province. I need hardly add that the Notification for Assam too followed suit. May I not say, happy omen once again in our present trials.

COST OF THE FRONTIER WAR

Brother-Delegates, I have said I will not discuss the question of Frontier Policy. But there is one aspect of

that question, one sequel to it which has a most important bearing not only on questions of domestic reform but on this matter of retrograde policy which we are considering. Who, might I ask, pays the cost of that Policy, begun more than twenty years ago, ordered out from England and by a British Cabinet against the remonstrances of a Viceroy, who resigned rather than be an instrument of carrying out that Policy, which has brought wars in its train, which has set on conflagration on the Frontier, which, besides sucking its scores of millions at recurrent periods from the taxation drawn from one of the poorest of populations on the face of the earth, has made a heavy permanent addition to the Military charges of India, which has laid its fatal and blighting fingers on almost every work of internal reform—for it needs money—on the promotion of the urgently-needed cause of technical education, on the industrial and commercial development of the country which would have blessed, and added to the resources of millions not only in this country but amongst the working-men of England? All that has been done in pursuance of this new Frontier and Forward Policy, which reversed all the traditions of the past, may have been necessary for the safety of the Indian Empire from the risk of external aggression. I am not arguing that question now, though we hold strong views on the subject. But, may I ask, if England, Imperial England, has no interest of her own in the safety of the Indian Empire? Has England no stake, no grave and momentous stake, yea, I ask, no vital interest in that safety? Is she quite sure that she would not suffer in her honour and prestige, in her commerce, in employment for her capital and for her people, in the loss of many of the millions that make up that precious item called the "Home Charges", if India's safety is imperilled and she is lost to the British Crown? And has England or her Government no moral responsibility for the consequences of a policy which she dictates, which the people of India, if they had the faintest whisper of a voice in controlling their affairs, yea, which the non-official English community resident in India and even the bulk, I believe, of the official community, would condemn almost

to a man? Ladies and Gentlemen, much as I believe in the principle of division of labour, I do not believe in that division which, in these Imperial matters, would make England decide the policy, and India bear the cost. We are unable to look upon that as a particularly happy, or a particularly just arrangement. Brother-Delegates, it is not as a mere dole, but as a claim of absolute justice, that we ask that the costs which have been incurred by the adoption of what has been known as the Forward Policy on the Indian Frontier question, and to meet the consequences which have followed from that adoption, should be distributed in some equitable proportion between England and India.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we all know what happened in the past, when, not long after the inception of the Forward Policy and the embroilment with Afghanistan, Mr. Gladstone came into power in 1880. The Government of that day made a contribution of five millions to India towards the cost of the Afghan War. We know too that the policy of retrogression, of reversing the principles of the past, which we are deploring, has been followed in this case also; that, even in a year when, in addition to the calamity of the Frontier War, India has been afflicted with famine and pestilence, with earthquake and cyclone, with every trouble indeed that can cause misery, suffering and loss to an unhappy people, the Government have declined to make any contribution towards the expenses of that war. England, which every year makes a grant to the revenues of Cyprus which, instead of becoming a "Place of Arms", has become a place of a very different description; which this year out of an overflowing Treasury has made a gift of nearly a million pounds to Egypt for her wars; which this year too has made a large grant to the West Indies, a considerable portion of which has further been promised to be annually repeated—I may as well enumerate some of the purposes—for her agricultural department and agricultural instruction, for steamer subsidies and in aid of local revenues, for assistance towards farming and working central factories, for making roads and purchase of lands—

England, which has done all these things, making new precedents for helping other countries, though her Government resisted and successfully resisted the motion made early this year to follow the old precedent, even at a time so calamitous as the present, of helping India. I think we may profitably spend a minute or two in considering this case of help to the West Indies. Mr. Chamberlain, in proposing the grant in the House of Commons, defended it on two grounds. First, on the ground of the loyalty of the Island—a loyalty which they manifested immediately afterwards not by gratitude but by deep dissatisfaction at the amount of the grant not being larger and by the loud expression of a desire for annexation to the United States—we have not heard if there have been any prosecutions for sedition there! And, secondly, on the ground of their value to England. As to the comparative value to England of the West Indies and of India in spite of my temptation to say much, I will content myself with only one significant sentence from the *Pioneer* of the 8th of October last:—

The West Indies are utterly worthless to Great Britain and it would be a relief if we could transfer them to the United States.

ENGLISH FEELING ON THE ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT

So glaring is the injustice that has been done to India that I may be mistaken, but I honestly believe, the bulk of the Unionist Members would have gladly joined the Liberals under Sir Henry Fowler and Mr. Samuel Smith in voting a grant but for the unhappy and retrograde attitude of the Government and the pressure of party influence. This is what the *Saturday Review*, a Conservative organ and a supporter of the Government, says referring to their conduct in this matter:—"It is a miracle," says that paper in its issue of the 26th of February last, "that in the face of such acts of injustice as this we can still maintain our Imperial Rule in India." I do not quote this to endorse it, but to show how widespread is the sympathy amongst Englishmen with India, and how keen was the indignation felt at this reversal of Mr. Gladstone's policy

of 1880, even amongst the supporters of the Government. I wonder what our Press Committees, busily engaged in delivering lectures gratuitously on good taste and decorum to the conductors of newspapers, and our Indian Government, would have done if language a hundredth as strong as this had appeared in any Indian paper. I wonder, too, whether an order will be passed to prevent the importation into India from England of "seditious" papers commencing with the *Saturday Review*, going through, I am afraid, a pretty long list, and ending, let us say, with the *Review of Reviews*, whose words of bitter and fiery denunciation against what it calls the "criminal imbecility" of the Administration I will not quote; and of speeches and writings too like those of such dangerous Conservatives, as, let us say, begging their pardon, the Hon'ble Member for Cardiff, or a late Chief Justice of Bengal.

ATTITUDE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Ladies and Gentlemen, the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Bristol, some little time before the opening of Parliament, led us to hope for a contribution from the Imperial Treasury. But our own Indian Government, we are told, did not want any help. A Government that has to put off reforms that are admittedly necessary for want of money; a Government that is unable to discharge one of the elementary duties of a civilized Government by placing its Administration of Justice on a proper footing, on account, as it says, of want of funds; a Government against the "shearing" policy of which at every revision of Provincial Contracts we have heard eloquent and vigorous protests from a late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal and from other high authorities; a Government pressed by the heavy demands not only of war, but of a combination of dire calamities unparalleled in the annals, perhaps, of any country in the world; a Government which is obliged heavily to borrow to meet its liabilities; a Government which has been compelled to close its mints and to raise artificially the value of its coin to the detriment of many interests, and specially the interests of the poor in order to avoid serious financial

disaster ; a Government that had the precedent before it of a similar grant on a previous occasion ; such a Government, declining to receive any help from the English Treasury or to be relieved of any portion of its Military expenditure, seems, I must confess, to our humble understanding, about the most extraordinary phenomenon one could think of ; and so indeed it seemed to very many people in England both inside and outside the Parliament. True, a leading Anglo-Indian journal advised them not accepting any help on the ground that this might lead the House of Commons to enquire into or meddle with their doings ; or, as it put the matter, " the mischief of Parliamentary interference with Indian affairs " would thereby " be exaggerated a hundredfold ". But I cannot believe that the many distinguished men who constitute the Government of India could possibly have acted under the influence of such an unworthy motive. But I am sure they will forgive us for saying that in view of this proceeding, and in the absence of further light, the people of this country cannot repose that confidence in them as the protectors of their interests and the guardians of their rights which it ought to be their duty to repose.

SOME EFFECTS OF THE FORWARD POLICY

In connection with the burdens imposed by the Forward Policy on the finances of the country and their blighting effect, one has only to turn to the so-called discussion on the Budget in the Provincial Councils to see how many are the measures whose necessity is admitted by the Government, but which cannot be carried out for want of means—and even those represent but a small fraction of all the important needs of the country for its development, progress and prosperity. In Bengal, the Government appointed some years ago a Commission called the Salaries Commission, which reported on the necessity in the public interests of an increase in the pay of the ministerial or subordinate establishments. The *Pioneer*, not long ago, if I remember aright, pointed out the absolute necessity of this increase and the serious evils to the Administration of the country resulting from the present

inadequate scale of pay. The Government has, over and over again in the Council Chamber, admitted the urgency of the reform but pleaded its want of means to carry it out. But, Brother-Delegates, I need not take up your time by bringing coal to Newcastle, by giving instances of what is so perfectly familiar to you. But permit me to refer to one matter which took place in the course of this year, not so familiar to us, unique in its history, and buried in the multitude of answers to Parliamentary questions.

A CENTRAL LABORATORY

Last year a memorial was presented to the Secretary of State for India signed by the leading scientific men in England, including such names as Lord Kelvin, Lord Lister, Professors Ramsay, Roscoe, Foster and a great many others, asking for the establishment of a Central Scientific Laboratory for advanced teaching and research in India. The Memorialists pointed out the great importance of the proposal, not only in the interests of higher education but also in the interests of the material advancement of the country; and Lord George Hamilton forwarded the Memorial with his recommendation, as I gather from Mr. Schwann's question a few months ago in Parliament, to the Government of India. But the Hon'ble Member was informed, in answer to his question, that the Indian Government was unable "to entertain so costly a scheme", on the ground that the initial cost of such an establishment would be six lakhs of rupees, or about £40,000. Why, if even two millions had been granted from the Imperial Government to relieve the resources of the Indian Government strained to meet the costs of the Frontier War, not only could this "costly scheme" have been started, but nine and forty other measures of benefit to the country of a similarly "costly" character could have been carried out. Allow me, Brother-Delegates, the privilege of being your mouthpiece to convey to these eminent men the expression of our heart-felt gratitude for the interest they have taken on India's behalf, and to express the earnest hope that their efforts and their representation will yet bear fruit, and ample fruit, in the better time to come.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

I need not dwell before you, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the imperative need of technical education which is, in a literal sense, of vital importance to the teeming poverty-stricken millions of India, the imperative need of improving the old industries and introducing new ones, of teaching the people how to utilise, with the help of modern science, the many rich and undeveloped resources of the country. This has, indeed, been admitted on every hand. I remember well the conversation which some of us had with Lord Dufferin shortly before his retirement. He regretted that he had been unable to do anything to further the cause of technical education, the importance of which to India he fully realized; but he had every confidence his successor would earnestly take up the question. Lord Lansdowne has come and gone, and his successor too—to whom we cordially wish every happiness after his many arduous labours amid the storm and stress of these years—will in a few days bid farewell to the scene of his labours; but the question of technical education stands practically where it did for want of means to promote it.

BACKWARD OR FORWARD

Brother-Delegates, I will take up more of your time by continuing this review of the past. I will leave it with only one remark. If I have been mistaken or however unwittingly unjust in that review, I shall rejoice to have the mistakes pointed out, and to be convinced by the fair weapons of reason and argument.

As one glances back over the history of these retrograde and repressive measures and sees that the stream of reaction is yet running, the question arises in the mind, and I ask our Rulers, nay all Englishmen, seriously to consider it, whether Backward or Forward is to be inscribed as the motto on the banner of England in its future administration of this great country. Are we to march backwards into the methods of despotism, to the weapons of coercion, to the policy of distrust; or are we to march onwards in the path which was traced out by those noble Englishmen.

who have been the founders, the consolidators, the saviours of the Empire, the path which leads to advancing and not to receding freedom, to greater trust in people, to rights enlarged and not to concessions withdrawn? For, it is at once a melancholy and a curious feature of the present situation that we stand here not merely in defence of the liberties of the people of India, but in vindication of the policy, the sagacity, the wisdom, and the foresight of those illustrious men.

INDIAN FEELING

To fulfil England's mission in India, much, very much remains to be done. We were eagerly and longingly looking forward to the steady and progressive carrying on of that work, but in its place has begun this process of pushing backwards, this process of distrust and repression. Will Englishmen place themselves for a moment in our position, look with our eyes, and try to realize what their feelings would have been under the circumstances? For that, after all, is the way to follow, if they wish to understand and not misunderstand the situation. There is much of the same human nature in the East as in the West. Is it any wonder that the process I have mentioned, and some speeches to which I will not more particularly refer which we have heard from the Council Chamber, should have caused widespread pain, surprise, regret and anxiety, yea, in some quarters, even bitterness? Let me give an illustration of this feeling of pain which struck me very much at the time. An Indian gentleman wrote to me in England a few months ago. He is not an "agitator", whatever that word may mean. He is a gentleman unknown to fame, who takes no part in public meetings or in the discussion of public questions, but quietly does the work of his office. He wrote to me about his brother then staying in England, but in the course of his letter, he mentioned about the recent proceedings of Government, and concluded with these words:—

Are you a friend to British Rule? Try your best to induce the authorities to withdraw the suicidal policy of Government. If you are an enemy, well, my advice is—keep quiet and let things take their course.

May I ask the authorities, if those words should by some chance happen to meet their eyes, to seriously consider the import of the sentence I have quoted, written in confidence, wrung in the anguish of his heart from a simple and quiet citizen, deeply attached to the British Rule? I trust my friend will forgive me for having quoted that sentence from his private letter. Let me quote another gentleman—not a nameless or a fameless one now—who, having served the Government with honor and distinction in charge of several most important districts, having risen to the highest post in the Executive Services of the Government to which a native of India has yet been appointed, has recently retired from the Service—need I say I refer to our distinguished countryman, Mr. R. C. Dutt. I congratulate my friend on his being unmuzzled. I trust he will now be in a position to render even greater service to the Government he has served so long and so faithfully, by his informed exposition of the effects of their recent policy than when he was fettered by the trammels of office. Speaking in condemnation of our new Law of Sedition at a Meeting held in London, on the 29th June last, Mr. Dutt said, with the authority of intimate knowledge:

It is with deep regret that I have to say that I can hardly remember any time—and my memory goes back to the time of the Mutiny—when the confidence of the people of India in the justice and fair play of English Rulers was so shaken as it has been within the last two years.

And he goes on to deplore the policy of suspicion and repression adopted of late by the Government, which has led to this most unhappy result.

It is the saddest of thoughts to my mind—the thought, Ladies and Gentlemen,—that the very means which, no doubt from the best of intentions, the Government have adopted to root out what they believe to be want of affection or disaffection in this country, will tend not to attach but to alienate, not to cure but to create those very evils they dread, to suppress, it may be, the expression of discontent, but to drive it deep beneath the surface.

THE EDUCATED CLASSES

Ladies and Gentlemen, turning again to the words of that touching appeal in the letter of my correspondent, it is because we are friends to British Rule, it is because all our highest hopes for the future, and not our hopes only but the hopes of generations to come, are indissolubly bound up with the continuance of that rule, with the strengthening and the bettering of that rule, with the removal of all and every cause which may tend to the weakening of that rule, that we speak out, and point the impolicy, the unwisdom, yea, the danger of the recent course of administrative and legislative proceedings that we are trying to the best of our power—alas, so limited—to induce the authorities and the great body of justice-loving and generous-minded Englishmen, both here and in England, to withdraw from that course, and find the path of safety, of honour, of mutual advantage and the truest and the most abiding glory, in going forward in fearless confidence, trusting the people, extending the bounds of freedom, not forging new fetters but gradually removing those that exist, not taking away, but adding to, the rights of the people, helping on the cause of India's regeneration with the passionate longing and the loving ardour that come limited from consciousness of a duty and a solemn responsibility from on high. The educated classes of India are the friends and not the foes of England, her natural and necessary allies in the great work that lies before her. It is on their hearty, devoted, and loving co-operation that the welfare and progress of the country so largely depend. It is the dangers of ignorance and the dark and strange phantoms that are born of ignorance that England has to fear, and not knowledge nor light. If, indeed, there be Englishmen who imagined otherwise, surely the riots at Tallab, at Bombay, at Calcutta, and elsewhere, must have opened even their eyes; and it was the influence and the efforts of the educated classes which prevented these unhappy outbursts from spreading or working much graver mischief. Let our Rulers realize with fulness of conviction this fundamental truth that in the ignorance of the people is the source, not of strength

but of danger, not of security but of peril, just as in the spread, wider and deeper spread of education, is the remedy, not the cause. All that the educated classes ask for is that England should be true to herself, that she should not forget the teachings of her history and the traditions of her past, that British Rule should be conducted on British principles, and not on Russian methods. Is this, Ladies and Gentlemen, sedition? or is it the highest homage which India can pay to England, the dawning of that glorious day, proudest in the history of England, foreseen as in a vision by Macaulay, when instructed in European knowledge we might ask for the blessings of European institutions? The educated classes wish and long for the strengthening and not the loosening of the bond which unites the two countries, and which is the guarantee not only of order but of progress; and they look forward to the time when they, too, can claim the rights, and share the glories of citizenship in the proudest Empire that the world has ever seen. Let it be the part of wisdom, of prudent statesmanship and political foresight, to foster and not to crush this feeling; to extend the hand of fellowship and love, ministering help, and not hurl insults, or the weapons and methods of coercion which wound but cannot heal.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

Brother-Delegates, the Indian National Congress has been described, and rightly described, as the noblest achievement of, and a crown of, glory for British Rule in India. And yet how great has been the ignorance, how gross the misrepresentations which have from time to time assailed it. I will not notice these misrepresentations of ignorance and prejudice. They have often been noticed before. But if it is at times disheartening to find this great movement, which ought to have been welcomed as a valued help, subjected to unworthy attacks, let us remember that this has been the fate of every great movement which has made for human progress or human welfare. It is cheering, on the other hand, to find ample recognition of the aims and the work of the Congress from many

quarters. I might quote the opinions of many high authorities, but I will content myself with placing before you the generous testimony of one eminent man, Sir Richard Garth, a good Conservative who, I believe, was a Conservative Member of Parliament before he came out to hold the exalted office of Chief Justice of Bengal, said a few years ago, replying to an attack which had been made on the Congress :

I will tell you what they have done. They have dared to think for themselves; and not only for themselves, but for millions of poor ignorant people who compose our Indian Empire. They have been content to sacrifice their own interests, and to brave the displeasure of Government in order to lend a helping hand to those poor people. They have had the courage and the patriotism to denounce abuses which have disgraced our Indian Rule for years past, which have been condemned by public opinion in India and in England, and to which the Indian Government appear to cling with a tenacity which seems utterly inexplicable. They have dared to propose reforms which, despite the resistance of the Government, have been approved by Parliament, and to endeavour to stay that fearful amount of extravagance which has been going on in India for years past, and has been the means, as some of our best and wisest Councillors consider, of bringing our European Empire to the verge of bankruptcy.

May the blessing, which is the portion of those who lift up their voice for the weak of this world, attend Sir Richard Garth in his retirement for this manly and noble vindication of the Congress against the misrepresentations, based on ignorance, of many in high places; for his strong words of condemnation, spoken with the experience and the authority of a position highest in the land, of the miserable system which combines judicial and executive functions in the same officer, and which of late has been further extended by our Government, and for his many other services to the cause of the people of India! And permit me, Brother-Delegates, in this wish to include the many other noble-hearted Englishmen—their number is not few, and their number, Ladies and Gentlemen, is growing every year and pretty fast—who have lent their generous advocacy to the views of the National Congress and to the cause of Indian progress.

A DREAMER OF THE WEST

Brother-Delegates, I read the other day, as no doubt many of you have done, a remarkable speech delivered in London by one of these noble-hearted Englishmen to whom I have referred, our good friend Professor Morison. In the course of that speech, he said that,

he looked forward to the time when they would have a Secretary of State and a Governor-General of India who would recognize clearly that it was impossible to govern the Indian Empire without the cordial co-operation of the Indian people, and who would send for the President of the National Congress, and say: 'Come my friend, have we not both the same interests at heart? Are we not both men of affairs? Come, let us reason together.'

I see also from the report that this sentiment was loudly cheered. I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, after this we must no longer speak of the Dreamy East. It appears that there is a Dreamy West too, and Professor Morison is one of its dreamers. I am afraid it will be a very long time before that dream of friendly conference he speaks of will come true. Not that any Viceroy would not find it of advantage to consult any of the distinguished men who have preceded me in the Chair—I make, I can make absolutely no claim for myself—to take representatives of educated India into his confidence, and to enter into that partnership of cordial co-operation that our friend speaks of, but it is not, Ladies and Gentlemen, always good things or desirable things that are the things of this actual world.

SYMPATHY—THE CURE

Brother-Delegates, I trust I have made the situation created by recent proceedings sufficiently clear. It is one to cause anxiety to every friend of India and England. But the remedy too is clear and, the narrative itself unfolds it. Sir Francis Maclean, the present Chief Justice of Bengal, is reported to have said at a meeting held in Calcutta, I believe early this year, when the Sedition Bill was before the public that, "he had heard a great deal recently since coming to India of sedition and measures in

connection with it; but it seemed to him the only rational way of putting down sedition was by sympathy, boundless sympathy with the people in their needs and their sufferings, and with their legitimate hopes and aspirations". These words deserve to be inscribed in letters of gold; and permit me, Ladies and Gentlemen, to offer to Sir Francis Maclean on your behalf our thanks for this noble utterance breathing the instincts of true statesmanship. Yes, it is sympathy, boundless sympathy with the people in their needs, and sympathy, too, with them in all their legitimate aspirations that is wanted—and then from that sympathy will naturally come, as rain-drops from the descending cloud, the many measures that are required to promote their interests and redress their grievances. With truer knowledge and keener sympathy, many things will assume a different aspect, and our Rulers will, if I may respectfully be permitted to say so, see things with new eyes. Then, indeed, will all the unrest that we have so much heard of, of late, vanish as before a magician's wand, as darkness before the rising sun. For, indeed, love and sympathy work miracles in the political, no less than in the moral or spiritual world. There can be no surer or firmer foundation for earthly power than the affection and confidence of its subjects. I have quoted the Chief Justice of Bengal; let me quote a few lines from Mr. Chamberlain's great speech at Glasgow, delivered on the 3rd of November of last year.

"The makers of Venice," said Mr. Chamberlain, "with whose peculiar circumstances as a commercial community, dependent for its existence on its command of the sea, we have much in common, declared it to be their principal object 'to have the heart and the affection of our citizens and subjects'; and in adopting this true principle of Empire, they found their reward in the loyalty of their colonies and dependencies when the Mother City was threatened by enemies, whom her success and prosperity had raised against her."

This, indeed, Ladies and Gentlemen, as Mr. Chamberlain has said, is the "true principle of Empire"—to possess the hearts of citizens as well as of subjects, and to win as its reward the loyalty alike of colonies and of dependencies.

And the same thing has been said in India too by all her wisest administrators. Let me refer here to a pamphlet written, not many years ago, by a man honored and trusted alike by Government and the people, Chairman of the Calcutta Corporation and subsequently Member of the Board of Revenue—the late Sir Henry Harrison—under the *nom de plume* of “Trust and Fear not”. It was written in support of the movement initiated—I am sorry to say unsuccessfully initiated—for the admission into the ranks of volunteers, of Indians possessing such qualifications of position, character, education, and physical fitness as the Government might see fit to prescribe. I would venture respectfully and strongly to recommend that little book to our Rulers. I have not seen more cogent reasoning, more convincing wealth of illustration, and truer or sounder principles of Indian Administration than are contained in that work.

AN APPEAL TO ENGLISHMEN

May I, Ladies and Gentlemen, make in this connection an appeal to all Englishmen in India, and specially to the conductors of the Anglo-Indian Press. In the term Englishmen, need I say that here and throughout this address I include Scotchmen and Irishmen, and men too from Wales. They are the strong and the highly placed. Their voice is listened to, whilst ours is unheeded. Is there no responsibility before God and man, on them by reason of this very power that they possess, this very influence they wield—responsibility not to widen the gulf between the races or make difficult the work of the statesman by unkind word or unkind deed, but to extend the hand of sympathy and help the people of India to rise once again in the scale of nations? If they mix with the people and come really to know them, they will perhaps find much to study, much to interest them and to make life even in India worth living, much to learn, to love and esteem, and even to admire. At least such has been the experience of many Englishmen who have tried the process. How often have I noticed with regret that the attacks and sarcasms of

some members of the Anglo-Indian Press have led perhaps to similar effusions or rejoinders in some Indian print. How one longs for men like Knight and Riach—to name the two I have personally known in my part of the country—men who wrote with knowledge and sympathy, who loved the people of India, felt in their conscience the burden of their responsibility to them, and proved true champions of their rights—men who have been followed by the gratitude of thousands of their fellow-men; I do not know if those who, either in India or in England, advocate the cause of unrepresented people of this country and use the powers that God has given them on their behalf, realize how they help towards making deeper the foundations of the Empire, in forging links of more than steel which fasten the bond, which binds England and India together. Once an honored missionary, he belonged to the Church of England, who had championed the cause of the people in my Province, was sent to jail on the prosecution of some of his own countrymen; but the name of Long went down deep into the hearts of the people, the cause for which he suffered, triumphed gloriously in the end, and his name is remembered in affectionate gratitude and sung in rustic ballads to this day. Let a nation, which is Christian, endeavour truly to shew the ideal of Christ, to carry out the divine command of doing to others what they would have wished done to themselves, in the exercise of its power, in its attitude towards Indian aspirations.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we want Englishmen to champion our cause; we want Englishmen, who have held aloft the standard of freedom and progress in every part of the world and have fought and suffered in that cause, to take up the cause of India—she has special claims on them—and advocate her rights. And I feel confident that as knowledge spreads, and the sense of the solemn responsibility that rests on them awakens, and the mists of prejudice and ignorance roll away, such men will arise and answer in gladness and joy to our call.

REFORM OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCILS

Brother-Delegates, I will not dwell on the necessity, which recent events have only served to emphasize of the further need of reform in our Legislative Councils. The subject has often been before us. But let me draw your attention to the question of the Constitution of our Executive Councils, and ask the Government on your behalf whether the time has not fully come for remodelling them, and admitting an adequate Indian representation in those bodies. It is these bodies that shape and guide the whole of the administrative policy of the Government, and decide questions of supreme importance to the happiness and well-being of the people—questions often of far greater moment than those that come before the Legislative Councils. At present out of the two hundred millions and more of India's people, not one solitary individual finds a place in any of those Councils; and as we know, the Legislative Bodies exercise no sort of control, direct or indirect, over them. Their deliberations are in secret Chambers, and not even the faintest echo of suggestion, information, or criticism can reach them from a public more ignorant of their proceedings than of the movements of the double stars or the composition of the Milky Way in the far-off heavens. Is it, Ladies and Gentlemen, necessary to point out, is it necessary to argue the point, that the most honest and impartial and fair-minded of tribunals cannot decide justly or do right unless every information is placed, every interest represented and every side of the question discussed before it? Is this not the explanation of the mistakes—I need not refer to the policy of these two years which I have fully discussed—of the grave mistakes which have *admittedly* been made in the past and which, as I have shown, were subsequently rectified when further light was sought from independent public opinion under pressure from England? We are fully aware of the need for the expansion and reform of our Legislative Councils. There is need, grave need, Brother-Delegates, for the expansion and reform of our Executive Councils also, and it may be, of their formation where they do not exist, with adequate Indian representation in them.

DIRECT REPRESENTATION OF INDIA IN PARLIAMENT

There is one other matter in this connection that I should like to place before you. The question of a further re-distribution of seats is likely soon to be before the English Public. It has already begun to engage attention. But whether that be so or not, it seems to me that for a proper representation of Indian views and Indian wants, a certain limited number of seats in the House of Commons, may be so few as, say fifteen, ought to be assigned to the inhabitants of some of the chief cities of India. We have the right to ask for this representation which will secure for us a hearing before the Assembly, which is the ultimate arbiter of our fates, but which at present, however anxious it may be to do justice and to give its due weight to Indian views, has no opportunity of knowing those views from persons speaking with knowledge and with authority on our behalf; and I am convinced this would be of great advantage to the furtherance of our legitimate interests and to the removal of our wants. If we can send a Sir Richard Garth or a Sir John Phear, a Hume or a Reynolds, if we could have sent a Caine or a Naoroji, a Bradlaugh before Northampton had at length returned him, or a Fawcett when Hackney had rejected him, not to speak of many others I could easily name, including many earnest and influential English friends of India—and send all these as our own representatives—can any one doubt what a potent factor for good, both to England and to India, for justice and fair play, would be brought into existence? And it would not only be in the House of Commons, but in the country too that they could speak with authority and command attention to our grievances.

It is true the Colonies are not represented in the House of Commons, but their Budgets are not discussed, nor their policy determined at Westminster; and as for the possible objection that, as in the case of Ireland, the presence of our representatives in Parliament might be used as an argument against the existence of the expansion of our Councils in India—it would be enough to say

that objection could only apply if India were to be represented in the House like Ireland in proportion to her population. But no one dreams of that. It is as a means to an end, a means, just and necessary in itself and effective for its purpose, that I suggest this for your consideration. And even if this concession were to be granted for a limited period, I would gratefully accept it. I will only add that I have talked with many friends in England who strongly agree as to the justice, and even the necessity of this reform, if Indian views are to be furthered. No doubt, as Sir Henry Fowler once said in an eloquent and memorable peroration, they are all Members for India. Yet I think Sir Henry Fowler and most Members of the House would be glad to have some members for India, to represent the vast interests of that country affected by the decisions of Parliament, whose claim to the title might be less questioned, whose assistance would be of service and from whom they could have the inestimable advantage of hearing something more than mere official versions of the matters that came up before them. And if this be an anomaly which has reason and justice on its side and which is rendered necessary by what has sometimes been called the anomaly of an Indian Empire, that the British Constitution has many anomalies which have much less to say for themselves and much less ground for their existence than this.

ORGANISATION AND CONTINUOUS WORK FOR THE CONGRESS

Brother-Delegates, I wish now to invite your attention to a most important matter. As I look round at this magnificent assembly gathered from the most distant parts of the country, as I see enthusiasm depicted on every face, the question presents itself to my mind, is the Congress to be a mere three days' affair? Is there to be no continuity, no plan and no method, in its every-day work? We have achieved much during these years that we have met. We have placed on record our views on all important questions of the day and even of the years to come. We have seen carried out some of the most important objects which have

engaged our attention, and to my mind of far more moment than all this, we have succeeded in bringing together and knitting in bonds of loving regard, of mutual esteem and fraternal co-operation, representatives from every part of this vast country, infusing national life, strengthening the bonds of common citizenship, kindling the fire of loyal and patriotic service. But Ladies and Gentlemen, the time has come when, if we are to reap the full fruits of our deliberations and to give *living force* to our resolutions, we must have a standing organization to carry on the work of the Congress from year's beginning to year's end, to carry on that work continuously, steadily, earnestly, sending agents and missionaries to different parts of the country, spreading information, awakening interest, issuing leaflets and pamphlets, educating the public mind, drawing attention to the many wants and grievances of the dumb masses, pointing out the duty we owe to Government, and helping the Government to the best of our power in its endeavours for the better administration, the better education, the better sanitation of the country,—and we must have men wholly devoted to this most important work. As I am standing before you, my mind goes back to the great gathering at Leicester in March last, the National Congress, I may say, of the Liberal Party which it was my privilege to attend and to address as a delegate from Cambridge. There are many points of resemblance that struck me between the Annual Meeting of the National Liberal Federation and the Indian National Congress. That meeting like ours holds its Session for three days, meets at different places from year to year, passes resolutions on subjects of interest to the party; and its number of delegates, I was struck to find, was very much what our number usually is. But behind all this what a difference! What a busy, active, powerful organization with a Secretary and a staff of officials wholly given to its work, with a Publishing Department with its separate staff of officials, with its Council Meetings held throughout the year and directing its operations, with its army of agents and workers and its allied Associations at work all over the country! And the same is the case with the great

Conservative Party whose organization won such splendid results at the last election. Brother-Delegates, I do not expect you to reach to such heights. And Rome was not built in a day, nor are organizations. They are the results of patient labour for many a long day. But let us resolve that at least a beginning, a fair beginning shall be made in the year before us, that when in the closing year of the century we meet once again, we may look back upon some work done, some foundation laid, some progress achieved in the direction I have ventured to indicate. Into the details of that organization I purposely do not enter. It may be that instead of one central office we may find it desirable to a large extent to decentralise and divide our work, it may be that we may link on our work in the different provinces with their respective Provincial Conferences. I trust the matter will be fully considered and a working plan formed before we separate. But one suggestion I would venture to make, that though it may be desirable for us to pass Resolutions in the Congress on a large variety of subjects, we should select a limited number of them and devote our attention in the coming year, if need be in the years to come, towards carrying them out. This will secure concentration, awaken greater interest and prevent the frittering away of our not superabundant energies.

And this brings me to the important question of a Constitution for the Congress, of which indeed what I have said above is a part. I trust Madras, which has been described as the home and nursery of India's statesmen, will have the credit of solving this question which has been before us for many years. The time has not perhaps yet come for a fully developed or an elaborate Constitution. But I would ask you to consider, whether we might not at least draw up some simple rule relating to our Constitution and laying down its framework which might be worked in the coming year and which, with the light of experience thus gained, might, if necessary, come up for re-consideration and all needed expansion at our next Session. Unless we make at least a beginning in some such way, I am afraid it will be long before we can make a start at all.

SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

What that limited number of questions may be, should you decide to adopt my suggestion, I leave to our leaders to decide. But whatever the programme may be, I trust it will not fail to include the two important and pressing questions of the Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions and of Police Reform.

Brother-Delegates, I will not argue the question of the Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions. I have seen the present system in practice and in actual experience for more than twenty years, and the more one sees of it, the more deeply one deplores the delay on the part of the Government in giving effect, even partial effect, to the principle underlying that proposal. Yes, that Government seems to have been busy of late, on the contrary, extraordinary and hard to believe as it may seem, in extending the Judicial powers of its Executive officers. The High Court of Calcutta has pronounced this combination of functions in the same officer as extremely dangerous, and it needs but the slightest of acquaintance with what happens before its Criminal Bench and elsewhere to know the practical every-day evils that follow from this combination. And what I have said of my province applies, as we all know, just as well, I am afraid sometimes even more, to other provinces of India. And let me observe in passing, it is not the men, but it is the system we condemn—the system under which the most conscientious and judicial tempered of men would find it so often impossible to deal unbiased justice. I have already mentioned the strong condemnation of the system by Sir Richard Garth. Let me refer to the Debate in the House of Lords in 1893, on what is known as the case of the Raja of Mymensingh. It was a petty Executive scandal compared to what constantly takes place in connection with poorer men, and for which the officer concerned, when subsequently threatened with a heavy suit for damages, had to make an apology in Court to the Raja; but it attracted considerable attention owing to the position of the victim. In the Debate to which I have

alluded, both Lord Kimberley, the then Secretary of State for India, and Lord Cross, his predecessor in that office, concurred in admitting the undesirability and the inconvenience of the present system of combining the functions. I will quote what Lord Cross said on the subject. Referring to the proposal of separating the two duties, his Lordship observed it was "a matter of the gravest importance," and that the plan to his mind "would be an excellent one resulting in vast good"—mark the words—"vast good to the Government of India". And later on when this subject was referred to in the House of Commons, the Under-Secretary of State repeated that, in the opinion of Lord Kimberley, "the union of Judicial and Executive powers is contrary to right principle".

THE FINANCIAL DIFFICULTY IN CARRYING OUT

THE REFORM

With such high authorities on our side, the very highest one could possibly wish for, it may be asked how is it that the present system is allowed to go on, and the "vast good" to the cause of administration Lord Cross spoke of is still unattained. I will give the answer in Lord Kimberley's words: "The difficulty," his Lordship observed in the Debate I have referred to, "is simply this, that if you were to alter the present system in India, you would have to double the staff throughout the country." How sad, Brother-Delegates, to think that this is the information as to the consequences of separating the functions, which some one at the India Office had placed before Lord Kimberley, and which, of course, Lord Kimberley was bound to accept. Doubling the staff throughout India! Why, the information is not only incorrect, but for most parts of the country, so materially incorrect that very slight acquaintance with the actual state of things on the part of the official supplying the information would have prevented its being furnished. But before I proceed with this matter, I will make one remark. Even if the statement I have referred to were correct, having regard to the importance of the matter, would it not have been the duty of the Indian Government

to have tried to carry out the reform, to make at least a beginning, even if it were at the price of some reduction in its Military expenditure or by curtailment of its expenses in some other way? The debate I have referred to took place in the month of May. Within three months of it, a scheme was published by Mr. R. C. Dutt himself, a District Magistrate and an experienced and trusted officer of Government in service at the time, going into the matter for the Province of Bengal; and shewing that the separation of the two functions could be carried out with but little or no extra expense on the part of the Government and with increased efficiency as regards the discharge of both the Administrative and the Judicial duties now vested in the same officer. I will quote here only some concluding sentences of Mr. Dutt's memorandum:

The scheme which has been briefly set forth in the preceding paragraphs is a practicable one, and can be introduced under the present circumstances of Bengal, excluding the backward tracts. I have worked both as a Sub-Divisional Officer and as a District Officer in many of the Districts in Bengal, and I would undertake to introduce the scheme in any Bengal District, and to work it on the lines indicated above.

And he adds, if this separation be carried out, the Police work, the Revenue work, and the general Executive work can then be performed by the District Officer with greater care and satisfaction to himself, and also greater satisfaction to the people in whose interests he administers the district.

The scheme of Mr. Dutt is one on the same simple and readily suggested lines as some others which had been set forth long before the debate in the House of Lords was, I may add, with some slight modifications approved on the one hand by Sir Richard Garth, who had held the highest Judicial office in Bengal, and on the other, by Mr. Reynolds, who had held the highest Executive office under the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, having been Chief Secretary for years, and afterwards Senior Member of the Board of Revenue for the Province. Here then was a practical scheme, dealing with an admitted and a grave evil, drawn up by a responsible and competent person, and afterwards approached by those who could indeed claim to

speaking on the subject with the very highest authority. But to pursue the history of the matter :

On the 29th of August of the same year, the Indian Association of Calcutta forwarded a Memorial to the Government of India through the Government of Bengal, enclosing Mr. Dutt's scheme, referring to the weighty expression of opinion on the subject in the House of Lords and elsewhere, and appealing to the Government to take that scheme into its earnest consideration in view to the introduction of the reform. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, more than five years have elapsed since that Memorial was submitted, and the Association, I believe, still waits for a reply. I would rather, Brother-Delegates, not make any comments on this matter, but leave the simple facts I have narrated to tell their own tale and to carry their own lessons. It remains for me to add that I believe other Associations too have in these years moved the Government in the matter; and I will leave the subject with the expression of a strong and fervent hope that this reform, as important in the cause of liberty of the subject as in the interest of good administration, and supported by a practical unanimity of opinion of the highest weight, will no longer be delayed or trifled with, and the painful scandals and miscarriages of justice which now so frequently occur will soon be the things of the past.

REFORM OF THE POLICE

Brother-Delegates, I have detained you longer than I intended on this question of separation of duties; but I thought it necessary to deal with this spectre of financial difficulty. As regards the Reform of the Police, my remarks will be few. There is not, Ladies and Gentlemen, a man, woman, or I might add, child in India, who requires to be told anything about, at any rate, this question. Indeed, I have heard many good men and true, discuss whether the total abolition of the Police Force, or at least of a very considerable portion of it, would not be much better than the present affliction. There has been a Police Commission, but in its practical results we seem to stand just where we did. The other day, in June last I think,

a paper was read on the subject in London at a Meeting of the East Indian Association by Mr. Whish; and Sir Lepel Griffin, who has seen long and distinguished service in India, and who holds the responsible position of Chairman of the Council of that Association, said: "There is no doubt that our administration in India is heavily weighed by the unpopularity attaching to the Police, who are rapacious and corrupt." This was said in England. Let us come to India. In a reported judgment which appeared in October last, I find the District Magistrate of Balia saying with reference to a case before him:

It is refreshing to find riot cases in which the Police appear neither to have tutored witnesses, nor to have included, for reasons of their own, the names of men who did not take part in them, nor what is more common, omitted the names of the most influential participants in the riot.

I hope there are here and there some more exceptions, even one of which the Balia Magistrate found so refreshing, to prove the general rule.

But, Ladies and Gentlemen, I must not go on quoting authorities on this subject, or I shall not know where to stop. I think I owe you an apology for having mentioned even these two. If our Rulers could only know and fully realize the amount of suffering and oppression caused to the people by the Police intended for their protection, I do not think that this sad blot on the administration could very long be allowed to remain. Here again it is not the men, it is not something inherent in Indian human nature, but the system which is responsible for so much. But instead of asking you to be content in this case with my authority, let me quote just a sentence from the paper of Mr. Whish to which I have already referred. Speaking with the authority of long and intimate personal knowledge, and describing "the intolerable burden of crime manufactured by the Police" and many similar matters, he adds he had no intention of "making any sort of complaint against the Indian Policeman himself; on the contrary, considering the

“vicious system under which he works, I consider it absolutely marvellous that he should be as good as he is”.

Brother-Delegates, I have mentioned the two questions of Separation of Executive and Judicial Functions and of Police Reform. To those who have studied the matter, there is an important connection between some aspect of the two questions into which however I do not propose to enter. But permit me to point out that, if ever there are questions which affect the masses of our people, the poorest of the poor, a great deal more than the rich, it is these two matters. In fact, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am not sure if a “rapacious and corrupt” Police, to use Sir Lepel Griffin’s expression, is not often rather an advantage than otherwise to an unscrupulous but well-to-do individual. There is only one more remark I will make before I leave this subject. Here in the Congress, we remember with gratitude the labours of our friend, Mr. Monomohan Ghose, a distinguished member of this body, who had made this question of the Judicial powers of Executive Officers peculiarly his own, and had worked for its furtherance until the closing hours of his life.

WORK IN ENGLAND.

How many other questions crowd to the mind—many of them of great importance—but I must resolutely turn my face away. There is a limit, Brother-Delegates, even to your indulgence. I have spoken to you of the work to which we might direct our attention in India, which needs to be done, and which I venture to hope will be done. Let me now turn to the other side of that work, the work in England. It is impossible to speak of it without our thoughts turning with deep gratitude to the British Committee headed by Sir William Wedderburn, containing such friends of India as Hume and Caine, Roberts and Naoroji, and many others whose names are so well known to you, and to their unselfish labours on India’s behalf. It is a matter of special satisfaction to us to see the growing number of meetings which are being held in England under the auspices of the Committee,

and this cannot fail to create, I trust and fervently hope, amongst the members of both the great Parties of England an increased interest and a great sense of responsibility in the affairs of this country. And how much we owe to our friends Mr. Chambers and Mr. Dutt, who may be said to have represented Bombay and Bengal in particular, for their eloquent, earnest and informed pleadings on India's behalf in meeting after meeting, carrying conviction and rousing interest. But in this connection, will you permit me, my friends from Madras, members and friends of the Congress whom I am glad to see present in such large numbers, whose patriotism and self-sacrifice, whose zeal and devotion, have made this Session of the Congress such a success in spite of many difficulties, will you permit me to ask when will your representative—or may I not use the plural number—start to do India's work in the land of our Rulers, and hold a meeting, not in the Hyde Park of Madras, but in that other Hyde Park where Londoners love to congregate? As to the methods and lines of expansion of the work in England, I need not speak. I had occasion not long ago to say a little on that subject in Bombay. But, Brother-Delegates, what I would specially draw your attention to is the need and the great importance of that work in England, the need of funds, and not less but even more, of men, capable and earnest, who will go from India, meet English audiences face to face and inform them of the actual state of things. That such men will meet with a patient and sympathetic hearing, and find amongst English people a desire to do full justice to the claims and aspirations of India, all past experience has shewn.

A MEETING AT CAMBRIDGE

Let me, as an illustration, refer to one meeting, and it will be only one. On the 9th of November of last year, it was my privilege to be present at the first meeting of a political character during my recent visit to England. After a lapse of three and twenty years, I found myself once again in the Hall of the Cambridge Union Society with its many Associations of the past, where the Motion

for Debate that day was one condemning the "Recent Policy of Coercion" in India. And after a full discussion, in which every shade of opinion was represented, a House which in its ordinary composition is Conservative in the proportion, I believe, of more than two to one, passed that Resolution condemning the action of the Government of India. There have been many meetings since then which Mr. Dutt and others have addressed, and amongst audiences of every variety; but I refer to this particular occasion, not only on account of the character of the meeting in its political composition, and that was remarkable, but also on account of the culture and the position of those taking part in it, and the possibilities in the future open to them. There was one remark in that Debate from an *ex-President* of the Union, who spoke in favour of the motion, which struck me very much. England, he said, after referring to her colonial policy, had learnt how to attach to her in bonds of affection people of her own race in distant parts of the world, by following a liberal policy of wise concession. But it would be, he added, a far prouder day to her when she succeeded in knitting to her and making her own, people of another race in her great Indian Empire, by following the same wise policy. I do not know whether my friend will ever come out as Viceroy of India. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, we shall have soon amongst us as our Viceroy an *ex-President* of the sister Union Society of Oxford. Let us trust that it will be given to Lord Curzon, endowed with the double gift of "Courage and Sympathy" of which he spoke, to steer the vessel of State and carry it on towards that goal which, we know, is also the high idea which he has set before himself in assuming his office.

There is one word more, Ladies and Gentlemen, which I must say. The English are often supposed to be a reserved nation. But speaking from experience of kindness which will remain engraved in my heart so long as memory lasts, of cordiality and even warm friendship from men whom I had never known before, I doubt if there are anywhere kinder and truer men and women, than are

to be met with in that country. Permit me, Brother-Delegates, from this great gathering to send not alone my own heart-felt gratitude for all this kindness—how its bright recollection rushes to the mind—but your acknowledgments also for help ungrudgingly given by them, for sympathy unstintedly shewn, and for interest whose warmth left nothing to be desired, on behalf of the cause of India and her people.

GRATITUDE TO GOVERNMENT

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have felt it my duty to examine and criticise many of the recent proceedings of the Government. But I have a pleasanter duty to perform before I close, the duty of expressing our gratitude to the Government for its changed attitude in regard to the policy of dealing with that calamity of the Plague which has now been afflicting the country for so long, and which, indeed, is not, as I am speaking, very far from our doors. Let whatever of mistakes, be they light or be they grave, which may have been made in the earlier stages, be forgotten; and I am sure, Brother-Delegates, it will be your earnest endeavour, as indeed it is your bounden duty, to render every possible help to Government in its efforts to meet this dire foe. And we thank the Government of Lord Sandhurst in particular for the considerate and deep spirit of sympathy shewn in its last Resolution dealing with the nature of plague operations, and let me add, for the statesmanlike resolve to which I believe it has lately come not to charge to Poona the cost of the Punitive Police Force, and for its opening the prison-door to Mr. Tilak. May we not hope that all these are happy indications of return to a policy of conciliation, sympathy, and trust, and of increased touch with the people—indications which will multiply until the grave mischief of the past is undone, and the path once more opened which leads to progress, reform, and contentment?

ENCOURAGEMENT TO EDUCATION

I shall presently refer to a liberal example of endowment in the cause of education; but before doing so permit me to note with gratitude the generous and magnificent

offer which Mr. Tata—a true benefactor of his country—has made in furtherance of the cause of higher scientific education. Perhaps I may also mention the offer by the Maharaja of Mymensing, in my Province, for the establishment of some scholarships for the encouragement of technical education by sending students to Europe, America or Japan. All these are truly encouraging signs, and let us hope there will be many in every part of the country to follow their noble example, and help on, in this and in every other directions, the cause of Indian progress.

SOME DEATHS

It is with deep regret we heard in September last the news of the sudden death of Sirdar Dyal Sing Majithia of Lahore, one of the leading noblemen of Punjab and belonging to an illustrious Sikh family—a tried and staunch friend of the Congress, as indeed of every good cause, on whose invitation and in no small measure by whose liberality the Session of the Congress was held at Lahore five years ago. It is a satisfaction to know that even in death he did not forget the cause of his country, which was ever so dear to his heart; and knowing that education was the basis on which every cause that makes for the progress of the country must rest, has left a munificent endowment for starting a First-Grade College in his native province. And now in the closing month of the year, not a fortnight ago, has passed away to the realm beyond, one of the noblest and the most illustrious of India's sons, illustrious not by birth and position alone, the Premier Nobleman of Bengal and the Head of its proud Aristocracy—but illustrious by that which is a higher nobility by far than that of birth and wealth—God's own nobility of a rich heart and a rich service in humanity's cause. In the Maharaja of Durbhanga, the British Government loses a loyal subject and perhaps the most trusted and honored of its Councillors, the country one of the greatest of its benefactors and staunchest of the defenders of its rights, and the Congress a friend, a generous helper, a warm supporter—none warmer—whose value no word that can fall from our lips can adequately express. Can

memory fail to go back at this moment to that scene when two years ago he came to the Congress Pavilion in Calcutta, the last he lived to attend, and the whole assembly rose as one man with an enthusiasm that knew no bounds, to welcome this true friend alike of the Government and of the people. To me, the deaths of Sirdar Dyal Sing and of the Maharaja of Durbhanga come with the suddenness and the poignancy of grief at the loss of two who were personal friends, and whom I had eagerly hoped soon to meet after a long absence. But they have, Ladies and Gentlemen, left examples behind, marks in the footprint of time, which we trust and pray may be an encouragement and a guide to others of their class, and to all true and loyal sons of India. Nor is yet the tale of death complete. For we have to mourn, too, the closing in its brilliant promise and amid many useful labours, of another career, in the death of Dr. Bahadurji of Bombay. Of all he did for his own Presidency, and of his devoted labours in the last two years, of his youthful life in battling with the plague and bringing succour to the afflicted, I need not speak. But on this platform from which he has often addressed us, we specially call to mind to-day his services to the cause of Medical Reform which he had made specially his own. Let others come and gather round the standard which has fallen from his hands before the battle was won.

THE MOTHERLAND

Ladies and Gentlemen, I began with a reference to Mr. Gladstone, and I will finish, too, with a reference to that great man. It was a cold morning when, closely muffled up, pale and ill, the great statesman was entering his carriage at Bournemouth, making the last journey of his life, on his way to Hawarden, there to die. A crowd had assembled at the station, to bid him farewell, to have a last look at the face not much longer destined for earth. In response to their cheers and salutations, Mr. Gladstone uttered these words—the last he uttered in public—he who had so often held audiences of his countrymen spell-bound by the magic of his voice: “God bless you all, and this place, and the land you love so well.” The words

were few, and the reporters added, the voice was low. But there was in them, the last words of the parting hero, a pathos of farewell and of benediction, a deep thrill as of another world, which produced an effect not less perhaps, but more, than the great efforts of a happier time. And let us, too, following those simple words of Mr. Gladstone, ask God that He may bless us all and this dear land of ours. Do you, do we, Brother-Delegates, love that land, the land that gave us birth; the land beloved of the gods, they say, in ages gone by, when the world was young and darkness lay over many of its peoples; the land where knowledge lighted her earliest torch, the arts of life and civilization found their home, and philosophy pondered deep over the problems of life; where Rishis sang those hymns to the Father in the shining sky, the earliest of the Aryan world, which still live and throb in our hearts, and the eyes of the Seer saw visions of things not of this world; that land where, after ages, the Sundered streams of Aryan life unite once again in the present day? That land, Brother Delegates, deserves all our love. Love her the more, cling to her the closer, for her misfortunes of the past, for the shadows and the clouds that have hung over her in the times that have gone. After centuries of darkness, the dawn of a better day has now opened for her, and the golden light has already begun to stream over her fair face. It depends on us, Brothers and Sisters, Fellow-citizens of this ancient land, it depends on us, on our sense of duty, on our spirit of loving sacrifice and earnest effort, whether the streaks of that light shall broaden and grow unto the lovely day. At length has India awakened from the stupor of ages, the fire of her intellect, of her heroism, of her piety, dimmed but yet not wholly extinguished, and waiting but the breeze of manly effort and kindly help to burn once again in the time to come, let us hope, with the splendour and lustre as of old.

Lord Salisbury spoke the other day of the living and the dying nations of the world. Shall India, Brother-Delegates, be a living nation, shall the glories that were hers remain for ever a memory of the past, or shall they once again be realities in the time before us? On us,

Brother-Delegates, depends the answer, on our efforts, on the lives we live and the sacrifices we make, not in the political field alone, but in many another field ; and let us not forget that never was progress won without sacrifice. And in that effort, depend upon it, we shall get, as indeed we claim, the loving help and the ardent sympathy of the great Nation, into whose hands Providence has entrusted the destinies of this land.

The German host marched to its triumph to the cry of " God and Fatherland ". Let ours be a still dearer cry, the cry of " God and Motherland ", as our mission also is the holier and nobler enterprise of peace, of love, of loyal progress, of every duty to our Beloved Sovereign faithfully discharged, of individual growth and national re-generation. Hear we, my friends, the trumpet-call of duty resounding to us amid the stirring scenes, the moving enthusiasm, the thrilling sight of this great gathering ? Yes, the call sounds clear, but let our hearts gather the strength to respond to that call, and to be true to her, our Common Mother, the Land of our Birth ; to be true and faithful to the light that is within us, and to every noble impulse that stirs within us. And may we, as we return to our homes, to the spheres of our daily duty, carry a little more of the living love to our country than when we came, a little more of the earnest longing to be good and true and useful, before the day closeth and our life's work is done !

Fifteenth Congress—Lucknow—1899

MR. R. C. DUTT, C.I.E.

INTRODUCTION

BABU BANSILAL SINGH, Nawabs, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I feel deeply honored by your action in electing me President at this Congress, but before we proceed to the business of this day, I should like, with permission, to read one or two, out of many messages which I have received of congratulation to this Congress. In the first place, Ladies and Gentlemen, I should like to read a message of congratulation and good wishes from your beloved President who presided last year, Mr. A. M. Bose. (*Cheers.*)

He telegraphs to me :—

Most keenly and deeply regret cannot attend from illness. God bless the Congress, the city of Lucknow, and our beloved Motherland, and bless our Rulers and gracious Sovereign. May your labours be fruitful, may all India unite in loving, loyal, ardent service to the ancient and glorious land that gave us birth, and rejoice in working and suffering for her sake.

I also wish to read one or two passages from a letter from our old friend, Mr. W. S. Caine :—

I am not able this year to attend the meeting of the Indian National Congress in which my interest is keener than ever, and about which my convictions are stronger every year, that is the most valuable and powerful factor in the development of the political future of India. . . . I beg you to be kind enough to convey by the cold medium of this letter those warm and cordial good wishes for the brilliant success of the Lucknow Congress, which I am unable to deliver by word of mouth.

My love to the Indian people, my belief in their future as a great self-governing portion of the British Empire, and my conviction of their natural capacity for self-government deepens and strengthens every year. I trust that God may inspire and direct your counsels and bring them to early fruition.

I have delivered to you one or two messages from the living, and it is but just that at the commencement of my speech, I shall refer in one or two words to those who have departed from us, especially to that distinguished countryman, who was a personal friend of mine, I mean Dr. Romesh Chander Mitter, who has been taken away from this world. You have not had amongst you a stronger friend of the Congress, a greater patriot and a more sincere and thoughtful son of India than Dr. Romesh Chander Mitter. The other great patriot was the late Maharaja of Dharbhanga, and I think a suitable expression of his good services to the Congress was already expressed at the last meeting by my friend, Mr. A. M. Bose. I don't wish to say many words with regard to the services of these gentlemen. We can only deplore their loss at a time when we all expected great services from their talents, their reputation and their love to the country.

Gentlemen, when in October last I received through my friend, Mr. Bonnerjee, your kind invitation to preside at this meeting of the Indian National Congress, I confess, I received it with some degree of surprise and some degree of hesitation and misgiving. I happened to be then engaged in the pleasant task, to which I have cheerfully devoted most of my spare time during the last fifteen years, of trying to interpret to my countrymen, and to modern readers generally, some of the literary heritage which has been left to us by our ancient forefathers; and I confess, the prospects of a sudden change from the desk to the platform somewhat alarmed me. Nor was the alarm altogether groundless; for when I read the magnificent speeches made from this platform in past years by some of the ablest and most eloquent men that our country has produced during this generation, I felt grave doubts whether you were altogether wise in your choice in asking me to preside in the present year. However, I felt the great honour you did me in imposing the task upon me; I feel the high honour which you have done me as I stand to-day among so many who are so well qualified to perform this task; and for better or for worse, I have accepted your kind proposal and I am

amidst you to-day. And if you will listen with some indulgence to the plain words of a plain man, I will try to convey to you in a few words some remarks, and some practical suggestions, on the administrative questions of the day.

I need hardly tell you that these questions have received my attention and my consideration for years past; I have spoken and written on them during the last two years; and during the preceding twenty-six years I had constantly to deal with many of them in official correspondence. It is perhaps known to all of you that the Government of India and the Local Governments permit and encourage the utmost freedom to all officials in the expression of their opinions in official correspondence on the administrative questions which constantly come up for discussion. It is in the course of such discussions that the men in the Civil Service come to know and to respect each other's opinions, and are often brought in closer contact with each other. And as we are holding this present meeting of our Congress in the North-West of India, I recall to-day with pride that it was in course of a discussion of this nature over the Bengal Tenancy Bill which was passed into law in 1885, that I had the pleasure and the privilege of first knowing that sympathetic ruler and that distinguished statesman whom you now claim as Lieutenant-Governor of these provinces (*applause, three cheers were called for,*) but whom we in Bengal are proud to claim as originally of the Bengal Civil Service.

Gentlemen, I often felt it my duty in the course of these official discussions to suggest reforms on the basis of accepting in a larger degree the co-operation of the people of India in the administration of the country. And, although I have ceased to be an official now, I still consider it my duty to do what lies in my humble power to advise and help the Government of the day in the great task of a good and successful administration based on the co-operation of the people. (*Cheers.*) And it is because this is precisely the object of the Indian National Congress—it is because it is your aim and endeavour to

sustain and help British administration based on popular co-operation—that I find myself amongst you to-day and in complete unison with you in views and aspirations.

THE CREED OF THE CONGRESS

Gentlemen, I have perused a great portion of the Congress literature as published in a handy volume by the enterprising publisher, Mr. Natesan; and to those who desire honestly to know the aims and aspirations of the educated men of India, I can honestly recommend a perusal of this valuable publication. An honest critic will find in this volume—from the first page to the last—a sincere desire to support and sustain the Government by the co-operation of the people, to strengthen the hands of the Government by fair criticism, to help the Government by keeping it informed of the views and aspirations of the people. These are services which would be useful and valuable to administrators in any country in the world, and these are services which are doubly valuable in India, where the people are not represented in any of the executive councils and secretariats where executive and legislative measures are first put into shape. For, remember, Gentlemen, that there are generally two sides to every question which comes up for discussion, and it is desirable and necessary that both sides should be properly represented and heard before the question is decided. It is no disrespect to the Civil Service of India to say that it represents, ably and fairly, the official side, only of Indian questions. I have had the honour of passing the best years of my life in the Indian Civil Service and I shall be the last person on earth to question either the ability or the honesty of purpose of those able and hard-working men who form that magnificent Service. I have pleasant recollections of the years which I have passed in complete accord and friendliness with my colleagues in that service, of the fair and handsome treatment which I received from my seniors, and of the loyal and zealous co-operation which I received from my juniors; and I will say this that—take the Indian Civil Service with all its faults and all its shortcomings—for hard work and honesty

of purpose there is not a finer body of administrators in the world. Nevertheless, it must be admitted, and it is no disrespect to the Indian Civil Service to say that that Service represents only the official view of Indian questions and does not and cannot represent the people's views. There are two sides to every question, and it is absolutely necessary for the purposes of good government and of just administration that not only the official view, but the people's view on every question should be represented and heard. There are local bodies in different parts of India which give expression to the people's views on local questions; but this National Congress is the only body in India which seeks to represent the views and aspirations of the people of India as a whole in the large and important, and if I may use the word, Imperial questions of administration. Therefore, this National Congress in doing a service to the Government the value of which cannot be over-estimated, and which I feel certain is appreciated by the Government itself. It is a gain to the administration to know what we feel, and what we think, and what we desire—though our demands cannot always be conceded. It is a help to responsible administrators to know in what direction our wishes and our aspirations tend, though they may not always agree with us. I honestly believe, therefore, that you are helping the cause of good administration, and of good government in India by your deliberations year after year, and I trust and hope that you will continue to carry on these deliberations in the future as you have done in the past, with good sense and moderation, with loyalty to our Rulers, and with fidelity to the real interests of the people. We cannot fail in this endeavour; the future is with us; and looking at the progress of nations all over the British Empire in every part of the world, I, for one, feel confident that we, too, are destined to move onwards as a portion of that great Empire, and that we, too, shall secure some measure of progress and self-government under the Imperial rule of England. This is the creed of the Congress, as it is mine, and it is, therefore, Gentlemen, that I feel it an honour to find myself amidst you to-day. And consistently with this.

principle, my speech to-day will be, not one of criticism but mainly and essentially one of practical suggestions to which the Government will, I humbly hope, give such consideration as they may seem to deserve.

FAMINE OF 1897

Gentlemen, it is a little over two years ago you celebrated in India, with every demonstration of loyalty and good feeling, the sixtieth year of the reign of the Queen Empress. (*Cheers.*) I happened to be in England on that day, and I witnessed with joy and gratification the august procession in London—Her Majesty driving in state through a circuit of six miles, preceded and followed by representative of every portion of the British Empire, and cheered by half-a-million of loyal Englishmen who lined the circuit. Every contingent from every land was cheered as it accompanied the Queen, and I can tell you that none was cheered more loudly and more heartily than the Indian contingent (*cheers*)—the Indian Princes and Rajas, distinguished by their graceful dress and noble demeanour, their manly bearing and their soldier-like appearance. It was a great and imposing and gratifying sight, but it was clouded by one dark shadow. The British public felt, British newspapers wrote, and British statesmen spoke, that while every self-governing colony represented in that procession was prosperous and happy, India alone, with its vast population, was even then suffering from a famine which had spread over a larger extent of country than had ever been visited by famine in any single year. Questions were asked why there should be such famines in India when famines were unheard of in any other well-governed country in the world, and doubts were expressed if British Rule in India had been altogether a blessing for the poor cultivators and labourers of India.

But, Gentlemen, the famine of 1897 was not the only calamity of that year; it was accompanied by a war outside our frontiers which cost us some millions and many brave lives, and it was accompanied by a plague, the ravages of which are not yet over. In the midst of these

calamities the Government thought it necessary to adopt rigorous measures, and the Government thought it wise to restrict that liberty of the Press which we in India had enjoyed for over sixty years. It is not my intention to-day to dwell on the sad occurrences of 1897, the saddest year in its accumulation of calamities since the time that India passed from the hands of the East India Company to the Crown. Nor is it my intention to review to-day the discussions which were held in this country and in England when the unfortunate Sedition Bills were passed into law.

SEDITION LAW OF 1898

I recall with sadness the debates which took place in the Viceroy's Council and in the House of Commons when these Bills were passed into law. It was my privilege to hear those debates in the House of Commons, and I think I only echo the general feeling of all educated men in this country when I acknowledge our deep debt of gratitude to those who so ably but so unsuccessfully fought for us both in the Viceroy's Council and in the House of Commons. I do not desire to renew these discussions, but now that the fight is over, and the Bills have been passed into law, I often ask myself if there is a single Englishman in this country with an intimate knowledge of the country and its people who honestly thinks that the reactionary measure was needed, or that it is answering any useful purpose, or that it has strengthened the Government and increased its reputation and credit in the eyes of Europe. Gentlemen, the measure was based on a blunder—the blunder of connecting sedition with the spread of education. The truth is precisely the reverse of this. English education had not only not produced sedition in the land, but it has been the strongest weapon by which the Government has stamped out real sedition in this country within the last fifty years. In the dark days of 1857 and earlier, there was real sedition in the land—a real wish in some dark and obscure corners to overturn this great Empire. That desire was born of ignorance and lurked amidst ignorant

classes, and the Government has successfully stamped out that feeling by the spread of education. There never was a greater Imperialist among the Governors-General of India than Lord Dalhousie, and Lord Dalhousie strengthened and fortified the Empire by giving effect to the famous educational dispatch of 1854, and spreading education through vernacular schools. There never was a stronger upholder of British Dominion in its darkest days than Lord Canning, and Lord Canning established the Universities of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. The same policy has been pursued by successive Viceroys during the last forty years with the same object and the same effect, and wherever education has spread, sedition in India is dead. And if real sedition still lingers in any corner of India, it is in the darkness of ignorance, not in the sunlight of education and free discussion. If I were disposed to foment sedition in India, I would desire in the first place to suppress all free discussion, suppress all newspapers, and suppress all public meetings, as a burglar puts out the lights of a room before he commits burglary. And I make bold to add, Gentlemen, that if you had been inspired by hostile feelings against British Rule in India, you would have worked in the dark, and not come forward from all parts of India, year after year, to openly and loyally place your views before the ruling power. Educated India has practically identified itself with British Rule, seeks to perpetuate British Rule, is loyal to the British Rule, as Lord Dufferin said, not through sentiment, but through the stronger motive of self-interest; because it is by a continuance of the British Rule that educated India seeks to secure that large measure of self-government, that position among the modern nations of the earth, which it is our aim and endeavour to secure. Gentlemen, if you had a single representative in the Viceroy's Executive Council, if you had one Indian Member to take part in those deliberations in the Executive Council, which resulted in the Sedition Law, you could have explained these matters then and there. But it is a penalty which all Governments constituted like the Executive Councils of India have to pay, that they have to

decide questions after hearing one side only, and not the other. Only one view is properly represented before them, and not the other; and the ablest, the most just, and the most conscientious of judges will make mistakes, if they base their decisions on evidence produced by one party, and not the other.

Only one word more before I leave this subject. I regret as much and as sincerely as any man in India the bitterness of tone which sometimes pervades journalism in this country. Five years ago, as Officiating Commissioner of Burdwan, I had occasion to write on this subject, and if I allude to my report now, it is because the report was printed and published in the *Calcutta Gazette*, and is therefore not an official secret. I said on that occasion, and on many succeeding occasions, that differences in opinion must always exist between the English newspapers and Indian newspapers in this country. English newspapers hold that an absolute Government is the best and only possible Government in India, and that any system of representation or self-Government is a mistake. The Indian papers hold, on the other hand, that there can be no good government in a large and civilised country like India, and no satisfactory solution of those great evils like famines and the impoverishment of the humbler classes, without some co-operation of the people themselves in the control of the Administration (*cheers*). It is possible, I said, to hold and maintain these opposite views without studied contempt and sneer on the one side, and bitterness of tone on the other side. And those journals which introduce this element of contempt and hatred in the discussion of administrative questions are creating difficulties for the British Government, and sowing seeds of evil in India. It is by some degree of sympathy, some degree of good feeling and neighbourly courtesy, and not by Sedition Laws, that the relations between the different sections of the Indian community can be improved. As one who has passed the best years of his life in administrative work, I have noticed that every improvement in the tone of the English Press is warmly responded to by the Indian Press

and that every want of kindness and good feeling adds to the difficulties of administration and weakens British Rule in India. (*Cheers.*)

CALCUTTA MUNICIPALITY

But I pass over this subject because it is not my object to-day to make my speech a criticism of the Sedition Law, or of other measures already passed. I wish also to pass over with very few remarks the controversies relating to recent Municipal Laws, and to the Calcutta Municipality. These controversies are fresh in your minds, and the subject will, no doubt, receive ample justice from other speakers before we have closed our proceedings. To me one most consoling feature in the history of this unfortunate measure is the help rendered to our cause by so high an authority as the Right Honourable Sir Henry Fowler. It was my privilege to be a listener in the House of Commons on the memorable night when the late Secretary of State spoke from the Liberal Front Bench, supporting Mr. Herbert Roberts and condemning the virtual withdrawal of that boon of Self-Government which it is the proud boast of England to have conferred on the Metropolis of India. Gentlemen, even Sir Henry Fowler has spoken in vain—at least, for the present—but we are none the less grateful to him for his strong advocacy of a just and righteous cause, the cause of Self-Government in India. Nor are we less grateful to those who have fought the same battle in this country, foremost among whom stands Raja Binay Krishna Deb, a worthy scion of a worthy house which has been loyal and friendly to British Rule in India since the days of Clive and Hastings. To our friends who fought in the Legislative Council, and to others who were true to the cause of our progress, is due our warmest acknowledgment and our deepest gratitude. Gentlemen, their example, their endeavours and their sustained effort will live in the memory of our countrymen and will find a place in the history of our country. A constitutional battle so fought is not fought in vain, and our children and our children's children, to whom we shall hand down the heritage of a loyal and constitutional agitation for

self-Government under the Imperial and progressive Rule of England, will look upon the closing of the nineteenth century as an epoch in the history of the land, and will draw new inspiration from the example of the men of this century who have lived and worked and fought—not in vain. There are defeats which are more glorious than victories; and the defeat which we have sustained will strengthen our hearts, freshen our hopes, and nerve our hands for new endeavours.

With regard to the actual result of this battle, I do not know if there is any class of men in Calcutta who in their hearts like it much. I have asked myself if there is any Englishman familiar with the history of the Calcutta Municipality who thinks that the new measure will improve administration, promote sanitation, or secure the willing co-operation of all classes of citizens. I do not know if the officials of Calcutta who have done so much in the past to foster Municipal Self-Government, will contemplate with gratification the ruin of the noble edifice which they built up with the labour of a quarter of a century. I do not know if the European merchants of Calcutta who are busy, practical men, and have lived in amity and good feeling with the Indian population, will like the idea to spread over the country that wherever English trade prospers, not only Indian manufactures but Indian political and municipal rights, too, must be sacrificed. I do not know if the new City Fathers of Calcutta contemplate with joy their prospects of performing, without the co-operation of the people, their difficult and thankless task, with a poor, inadequate, almost beggarly income. What the elected Commissioners have done in the way of sanitary reforms with this poor income is a matter of history. Gentlemen, I remember Calcutta some forty years ago under the administration of Government officials, when we as schoolboys had to walk to school by open drains and reeking filth. I remember Calcutta as it was under the Justices of the Peace, some thirty years ago, with its awkward tale of waste and jobbery. And I have seen year after year the improvements effected, the sanitary reforms done,

the wasteful expenditure cut down, and every department of the office brought to order by the elected Commissioners within the last twenty-five years—by some of the best men whom our country has produced, and who have given years of their life to this patriotic work. Their work has been consistently recognized in past years by successive rulers of the land; but it is necessary to give a dog a bad name in order to hang it; and it was reserved for Sir Alexander Mackenzie, who was a friend of Self-Government under the administration of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Ripon, to end his career in India by giving the Self-Government system in Calcutta a bad name, and then effectually strangling it. (*Shame, shame.*)

Gentlemen, I feel sad whenever I think over these matters, and I feel sad when I recollect that this thing has come to pass in the first year of Lord Curzon's administration. I honestly believe that no Viceroy ever came out to India with a more sincere desire to work for the good of the people and with the help and co-operation of the people. I honestly think that His Lordship in Council gave a most careful consideration to the question before he issued his own proposals; and if that Council had contained a single Indian member to represent the Indian view of the question and to explain the true history of the Municipality during the last forty years, I am persuaded Lord Curzon would have taken the same view as Sir Henry Fowler has taken and would have effected the needed reforms in the Calcutta Municipality and strengthened the executive without virtually sacrificing Self-Government. But our difficulty and our danger lie in this, that great administrative questions are discussed and settled in Executive Councils, where we are not represented and not heard. I do not say that the official view is necessarily wrong, and that our view is necessarily right; but I do say that both views should be fairly represented before the tribunal which shapes our destinies. I do not say that we have more knowledge or more experience or more ability than the high officials who represent the official view of the question, but I do say that we view questions from a different point

of view, and that there should be a constitutional channel for the representation of our views in the Executive Councils of the Empire. For, when the Executive Councils have decided a question, the thing is done—the Legislative Councils simply carry out the official mandate with unimportant alterations as the Bengal Council has done in the case of their Municipal Bill.

FAMINE OF 1899

But, Gentlemen, I must extricate myself from this subject and pass on at once to the great calamity which now stares us in the face, the famine from which millions of our countrymen are suffering even now; and with your permission I will devote all my remaining time to this one great subject—which appears to me to be one of paramount importance—the famines of India, and the condition of our poorer classes. Gentlemen, you are aware of the prompt measures which have been already adopted by the Government of Lord Curzon for the relief of distress in British Territory and for helping Indian Princes to relieve distress in Native States during this time of trouble and anxiety. And those of you who have had experience of relief operations in previous famines will feel confident that Englishmen, when they have once put their hand to the plough, will not leave the work half done. It is with a pardonable pride that I recall past days when I myself was employed along with my English colleagues in famine relief operations, or in providing against impending famines in 1874, in 1876, and in 1896, and judging from my past experience, and judging from the measures adopted this year, I feel confident that no effort, no expenditure, no means humanly possible, will be spared by a benevolent Government to save life and to relieve distress among the millions of our suffering countrymen. And in the face of this calamity it behoves us all, it behoves this National Congress, to do all we can to strengthen the hands of the Government, to offer our help according to our capacity and power, and to place our suggestions before the Government, not in a spirit of criticism but in a spirit of loyalty and co-operation, for

the relief of the present distress and for the prevention of such distress in future.

ALLEGED CAUSES OF FAMINES

It is in this spirit that I suggest that the time has come when it is desirable to take some effective measures to improve the condition of the agricultural population of India. Their poverty, their distress, their indebtedness, all this is not their fault. Sometimes it is asserted that the poverty of the people and the famines which we witness in India, and in no other well-governed country on earth, are due to the over-increase in population. Gentlemen, this is not so. (*Hear, hear.*) If you go into figures, you will find that the population does not increase in India as fast as it does in many European countries like Germany and England. (*Hear, hear.*) And if you read the paper written by Mr. Baines, the late Census Commissioner of India, in the first volume of the British Empire Series recently issued in London, you will find the Census Commissioner has distinctly stated that the growth of population in India is not so fast as that in Germany or in England. Sometimes, again, it is asserted that the poverty of the Indian agriculturist is due to his own improvidence, wastefulness, and folly. Gentlemen, this is not so. Those who have passed the best portion of their life among the Indian cultivators, as I have done, will tell you that the Indian cultivator is about the most frugal, the most provident, the most thoughtful about his future, among all races of cultivators on earth. (*Applause.*) If he goes to the money-lender, it is not because he is in love with the money-lender but because he has nothing to eat. If he pays 25 or 37 per cent. as interest on loans, it is because he cannot get loans on lower interest on such security as he can offer.

PUNJAB LAND ALIENATION BILL

We are all aware that the Government of India are at the present time endeavouring to safeguard the interests of the cultivators in the Punjab and elsewhere from the claims of money-lenders on their land. I do not wish to

speak on the merits of the Bill, because I never wish to say a word or to express an opinion on inadequate information, and the information I have been able to gather about the condition of the Punjab cultivators is not yet as full and complete as I could wish it to be. All that I can say is that this idea, that the condition of cultivators can be improved not by helping them to save, but by restricting their right of sale and mortgage, is an old idea which has been found utterly unsound in Bengal. The policy was advocated when the Bengal Tenancy Bill was under discussion fifteen years ago; I myself took my humble part in strongly resisting the policy; and if I remember correctly, the able Revenue Secretary of Bengal, who is now the Lieutenant-Governor of these Provinces, took the same view. I allude to these views because they are no secret, and will be found published in the *Calcutta Gazette* of that year. The absurdity of relieving the cultivators by virtually taking away from the market-value of the one property they have on earth was strongly exposed, and the idea of placing any restrictions on mortgage and sale of lands was ultimately abandoned.

Curiously enough, the question was mooted again in Bengal only three years ago, showing what vast importance is attached to official views and ideas formed in close Council Chambers. The fear was entertained that land was slipping away from the hands of the cultivating classes to the hands of the money-lending classes and that to restrict the right of sale and mortgage was the only remedy. I happened to be then acting as Commissioner of Orissa, a part of Bengal which is not permanently settled and where the condition of the cultivators is worse than in other parts of Bengal. If the free right of sale or mortgage has worked evil in any part of Bengal, it must have done so in Orissa. But I was able to show from the records of half-a-century that, although the right of sale and of mortgage had been freely exercised, land had not slipped out of the hands of the cultivating classes, and that to take away from the market-value of the land was not the best way to help the cultivators. Fortunately the

greatest revenue authority of Bengal, Mr. Stevens, who afterwards acted as Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, took the same view, and the idea of helping the cultivators by decreasing the market-value of their land was once more abandoned. I do not wish, Gentlemen, to generalise on these facts; I do not wish to infer that what would be needless and mischievous in Bengal and Orissa may not be needful and useful for the time being in some parts of India, where matters may have reached a more acute stage. But what I do wish to emphasize is that such remedies cannot permanently improve the condition of the cultivators; that in order to improve their condition, we must make it possible for them—as it is possible in Bengal—to save in good years against failure of harvest in bad years.

REAL CAUSE OF FAMINES, AND THE REMEDY

Gentlemen, the real cause of the poverty of our agricultural population is simple and even obvious, if we have the courage and the honesty to seek for it and to grasp it. It is not over population, for the population does not increase faster than in European countries, does not increase faster than the area of cultivation. It is not the natural improvidence of the cultivator, for those who know the Indian cultivator will tell you that with all his ignorance and superstition, he is as provident as frugal, as shrewd in matters of his own interest as the cultivator in any part of the globe. The real cause of his wretchedness and indebtedness is that, except in Bengal and a few other tracts, the land assessment is so heavy that the cultivator is not able to save in good years enough to meet the failure of harvests in bad years. All our village industries, like spinning and weaving, have been killed by a free competition with the steam and machinery of England. Our cultivators and even our village industrial classes, therefore, virtually depend on the soil as the one remaining source of their subsistence. The land assessments should, therefore, be made in a liberal and even a generous spirit. There is every desire in the high officials to make the assessments in a liberal spirit, but as the people have no voice in controlling these assessments, they are found in the actual

working to be often illiberal and harsh. They do not leave the cultivators enough to be able to save, and cultivators therefore fall victims to famine whenever the harvests fail.

BENGAL

The old Hindu Law, based on the actual experience of thousands of years, sanctioned one-sixth the gross produce of the land as its proper rent. The experience of modern times confirms the wisdom of this ancient rule. In Bengal, where the Permanent Settlement and the Land Laws of 1859, 1868 and 1885, save the cultivators from undue enhancements, the average rent paid by cultivators to landlords does not exceed one-sixth the gross produce in any district, and falls far short of it in eastern districts. The result is that Permanently Settled Bengal, which suffered from the most terrible famine in the last century, has been generally free from destructive famines in recent times. The famines of Behar in 1874 and 1897 were comparatively mild, and there was no loss of life. Extend the Bengal rule to other parts of India; make one-sixth the gross produce the maximum rent leviable from cultivators in other provinces, and the problem of preventing famines in India is solved.

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES

In the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, the cultivators are, generally speaking, not safeguarded by a Permanent Settlement. Each new assessment means an increase in Government revenue. Let us find out in what position the actual cultivator is left by such settlements. The system of settlements in the North-Western Provinces has often been described, but I have never seen a more lucid account of it within a brief compass than in the evidence of Sir Antony MacDonnell before the Currency Committee which lately sat in London. Read His Honor's answer to questions No. 5737 to 5740, and you have a clear account of the North-West Settlements in a nutshell. There are two salient facts which I will place before you from this account. In the first place, the Government allows the landlords to make their own

arrangement with the cultivators, and then demands one-half what the landlord actually gets, after making certain reductions. In the second place, under these arrangements, the landlords are actually getting about 20 per cent. of the gross produce in money, and the Government share is one-half of that. Gentlemen, these arrangements are better than those in many other parts of India, and you may be sure the rules are worked considerably, and even leniently, by a ruler who yields to none in India in his real sympathy for the actual cultivator. (*Hear, hear.*) But nevertheless I should have been relieved to learn that the 20 per cent. of the gross produce represented the maximum limit of rent, and not the average rent. Without such a maximum limit, the cultivator has no assurance against over-assessment and undue enhancement. And a landlord who has submitted to an increase of the Government demand at a settlement has the temptation to reimburse himself by raising his rents—as a squeezed sponge fills itself when thrown into the water—to be spueezed again at the next settlement, thirty years later. Adopt the ancient Hindu rule, which is virtually still the rule in Bengal; make one-sixth the actual produce—or even one-fifth the actual produce—the limit of rent under all circumstances, and you make the cultivators of these provinces as prosperous as they are in Bengal, and the problem of disastrous and fatal famines is virtually solved.

MADRAS

The state of things is far worse in Madras. Some portions of the Madras Presidency are permanently settled, but in the greater portion of the Province the revenue is not permanently settled, there is no class of landlords, and the Government demands as revenue one-half of the net produce of the land, *i.e.*, of the produce after deducting the cost of cultivation. For a clear and luminous and brief account of how this system has worked, I would refer you to the speeches made in recent years by the Raja of Bobbili, by the Hon'ble Subba Rao, and by Mr. Venkataratnam, himself a large landholder and President of the Godavari District Association. They point out that the

rights of the Madras cultivators have not been strengthened, as in Bengal, by successive Acts within this half century, but have been weakened by successive measures of the Government. They point out that in 1857, the proprietary right of the cultivator with fixity of assessment was admitted by the Government; that in 1882, under Lord Ripon's administration, a virtual pledge was given that no enhancements would be allowed except on the equitable ground of a rise in prices; and that at the present day these pledges are ignored, these safeguards are withdrawn, and enhancements are actually made on the ground of re-classification of soils as well as of rise in prices. More than this, I read a passage in the Madras Standing Information of 1879, quoted in the *Hindu* newspaper of Madras, that the land tax estimated at one-half the net produce should not exceed 40 per cent. of gross produce where the land is irrigated at Government cost, and should not exceed 33 per cent. of the gross produce in the case of lands not so irrigated. When I read a rule like this, I am filled with bewilderment and pain. Where is the old Hindu rule fixing one-sixth of the produce as the proper rent—a rule which is virtually observed in Bengal at the present day with such happy results? Let me mention, Gentlemen, that when the Tenancy Bill of Bengal was under discussion in 1884, I had the honour to recommend that 20 per cent. of the gross produce—which is a little over the old Hindu rate—should be fixed as the maximum of rent payable by a cultivator. My proposal was accepted by the then Revenue Secretary of Bengal, who is now the honoured ruler of these N.-W. Provinces. The proposal accordingly found a place in the Tenancy Bill drafted by the Government of Bengal, but it was not ultimately passed into law, because, in many parts of Bengal, the zemindars were getting much less than 20 per cent. of the produce; and to frame a rule about maximum rent might induce landlords in all parts of Bengal to screw up the rental to that maximum. The argument was good and I was not sorry that my proposal was rejected. But it is somewhat curious that while the Bengal Government declined to fix 20 per cent. of the produce as the maximum

of rent, for fear that the zemindars might work up to that rate, the Madras Government had actually a rule in their Standing Information Book fixing 33 and 40 per cent. of the gross produce as the maximum rent. Are you surprised that under the circumstances there should be such repeated and disastrous famines in Madras, and that as pointed out by Mr. A. Rogers—late of the Indian Civil Service and a high authority in revenue matters—a great deal of land is out of cultivation because cultivators cannot pay the rent that is demanded by the State Landlord? The rule in Madras is, as I have said before, to demand one-half the net produce, *i.e.*, the value of the produce after deducting the cost of cultivation. Gentlemen, I state it from my experience that such calculations cannot be accurately made, and that every mistake made is fatal to the cultivators. And I also state it from my experience that one-half of the net produce—not of the assets of the zemindars as in the North-Western Provinces, but of the net produce of the land—is a ruinous rate of land tax which is bound to bring the cultivating classes into wretchedness and poverty and to disastrous famines in every year of the failure of crops. Adopt the old Indian rule—the rule which is practically observed in Bengal with such happy results—and you relieve the cultivating population of Madras, and virtually solve the problem of famines.

BOMBAY AND THE PUNJAB

Gentlemen, I have not time to-day to go over the land revenue arrangements in other parts of India—of the Bombay Presidency or of the Punjab. In Bombay, we have generally the same system as the Madras, the Government generally receiving rents direct from the cultivators. But the Settlement Officers in Bombay take into consideration what have been paid by cultivators in previous years without difficulty, and do not proceed merely on paper calculations; and so far the Bombay method is better than the Madras method. In the Punjab, the land system is somewhat similar to that of the North-Western Provinces; but you will find on examination

that neither in Bombay nor in the Punjab is the cultivator assured of getting an adequate proportion of the produce of the land he cultivates and without such assurance his condition cannot be improved, and he cannot be saved from famines merely by tinkering with his relations with his money-lender. I am not discussing to-day the merits of the different systems prevailing in the different provinces of India—the *Zemindari* system of Bengal, the *Talukdari* system of Oudh, the *Mahahwari* system of the North-West, the *Malguzari* system of Central India, or the *Ryotwari* system of Southern India. Nor am I discussing the desirability of extending the Permanent Settlement to all parts of India as was recommended by Lord Canning in 1860, though I myself think that would be a wise and a generous measure to which the Government is pledged by its many promises in the past. I am not entering into these subjects in order to avoid all discussion, all controversy; and I am laying down a proposal which must receive universal assent without any controversy, *viz.*, that the cultivator should be assured an adequate share of the produce of his land if he is to be saved from indebtedness and poverty, distress and famine. I have confined myself to the actual condition of the cultivator and the incidence of the land tax on the cultivator, for in India the cultivator is the nation. Never mind under what system or under what settlement he lives, assure to him an adequate proportion out of the produce of his land—such a proportion as the old Hindu Law assured him, and the custom in modern Bengal assures him—and he is saved, and the nation is saved.

CENTRAL PROVINCES

But before I leave this subject I must say one word about the Central Provinces of India, which have suffered so disastrously in the famine of 1897, and which is suffering once more under the famine of 1899. The Central Provinces have suffered more from recent famines than any other part of India, because the land-revenue settlements have been more severe and more harsh, not in their intention, but in their actual operation, than any other part

of India. I constantly heard in England, as I have no doubt you constantly heard in this country, of the disastrous results of the recent revenue settlements in that Province, initiated by Sir Alexander Mackenzie and completed by his successors. But I will not mention here what I have heard, I will limit my remarks entirely to the facts contained in official reports and stated in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for India in reply to questions put to him in March last year by one of the truest friends of the Indian cultivator, Mr. Samuel Smith.

Gentlemen, there is a healthy rule, generally followed in the North-Western Provinces, that settlements are made for thirty years, because it is undesirable to harass the people with frequent enhancements and frequent settlement operations. The rulers of the Central Provinces have departed from this rule and made the present settlement for twenty years, save in a few backward tracts where I suppose still shorter settlements have been made. There is another healthy rule followed in the North-Western Provinces, that the land-revenue is fixed at one-half the rental received by landlords. Will you believe it that in the eastern and southern districts of the Central Provinces, the Government revenue was fixed between 55 and 75 per cent. of the rent in the previous settlement, and between 50 and 60 per cent. in the recent settlement? Add to this another 12 per cent. for certain local rates, and the Government demand on the Malguzars comes to about 72 per cent. of their supposed collections. I ask every impartial man, every fair-minded administrator, why settlements have been made in the Central Provinces for twenty years or less when settlements are made in the North-West for thirty years? I ask every responsible Ruler why the Government should demand 60 per cent. as rent, *plus* 12 per cent. as rates, from the Malguzar of the Central Provinces when the Government receives only about 40 per cent. in the North-West according to the evidence of Sir Antony MacDonnell? These differences in figures may not mean much to the theoretical statesman, but they mean life and death to the Indian cultivator. (*Hear,*

hear.) Every tampering with the settled rules in land settlements, every lowering of the period of settlement, every increase in the proportion of the Government demand, means the further impoverishment of the cultivators, means increased wretchedness and indebtedness in ordinary times, increased deaths in famines. Why, Gentlemen, this very experiment was tried in these North-Western Provinces; the Government demand at first was not half but two-thirds of the assets of the landlords; and that rule created a degree of suffering to the people greater than all the wars of the first-half of this century. That rule was ultimately abandoned in 1855, and the Government demand was fixed at one-half the rental of the landlords; and is it fair that we should go back in the Central Provinces to the old rule which our experience has taught us here to be harsh and cruel to the cultivators? If the people had any control over the Executive action in the Central Provinces, the tampering with the old established settlement rules would not have been allowed. If the people had been represented in the Viceroy's Executive Council to express these matters, no Viceroy of India would have permitted such departure from the usual settlement rules, a departure which has been disastrous in its consequences on the condition of the people, and increased the deaths from famines in the Central Provinces.

Gentlemen, I have detained you longer on this subject than I had intended, but the importance of the subject is my excuse. I state my deliberate opinion, based on a careful study of the question for thirty years, that the land revenue arrangements in India are responsible, not for bringing on famines, but for deepening the effects of these famines; and, secondly, that if the position of the cultivator was assured—as it is assured by the Hindu Laws, and as it is assured in Bengal—loss of lives could be prevented on the occurrence of famines, as it has been prevented in Bengal. British administration has done much for us; it has given us internal peace, it has given us education, it has brought us nearer to Western civilisation. But British administration has not performed all its duty so long as

the country is desolated by famines, unheard of in any other civilised and well-governed country. My conviction is, and I lay it loyally before the Government, that these frequent and acute famines are mainly owing to the cause that our village industries are gone and our village lands are over-assessed. (*Hear, hear.*) My conviction is, and I say it loyally before the Government, that this enormous loss of lives is preventible, and could be avoided through more considerate land settlements, assuring to the cultivator in every Province an adequate proportion of the food that he produces.

MILITARY EXPENDITURE, CURRENCY, NATIONAL DEBT

Gentlemen, there are various other causes of the poverty of India under the British Rule which I have not touched upon to-day, and which I do not wish to touch upon, because they have been discussed ably, eloquently, and repeatedly by yourselves at previous meetings of this Congress, and some of them will be discussed again this year by other speakers. There is the question of the enormous Military Expenditure, and the maintenance of a vast army out of the resources of India, not for the requirements of India, but for the requirements of the British Empire in Asia, Africa, and even in Europe. There is the question of the National Debt, which, in Great Britain, has been reduced by about 175 millions since 1860, and which has gone up by over 100 millions in India within the period, causing an increasing drain out of the revenues of India for the payment of interest in England. There is the question of the Currency which has been lately settled by the Currency Committee in a manner not conducive to the interests of the millions of cultivators whose debts have been increased, and savings depreciated. There is the question of encouraging and helping the Industrial Classes ruined by unfair competition, a question which has been ably and exhaustively dealt with by one of the most learned and thoughtful writers of this generation, the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranade of Bombay. And there is the question of the possible saving of expenditure by the larger employment of the educated people

of India, not only in the Indian Civil Service, but in the higher grades of all services, Educational and Medical, and Engineering, Post Office and Telegraph. Three generations of Indians have been educated in English Schools and Colleges in India; they have proved their fitness and capacity in every place they have held; and yet they are virtually Uitlanders in their own country, so far as a real control over administration is concerned.

I pass over these and other cognate subjects because I have no time to deal with them, and because you have often dealt with them eloquently and exhaustively, and will deal with many of them again. I will only repeat that it is perfectly possible to cut down expenditure, to moderate land assessments, to revive industries, and to prevent deaths from famines, if there is a real and honest determination to rule India for the good of the people, and with the co-operation of the people.

Gentlemen, I desire with your permission to add a word or two on this last subject, *viz.*, the desirability of enlisting the co-operation of the people in the work of administration,—the desirability of bringing the administration in closer touch with the people, and bringing our rulers in closer touch with ourselves. This is desired by every enlightened and far-sighted ruler as well as by ourselves; and this is calculated to improve the administration and to make British Rule in India stronger and more popular. A commencement has been made in this direction since the days of Munro and Elphinstone and Lord William Bentinck; and what I will suggest is not a new departure but a progress in the lines already laid down. I do not myself believe in new departures and novel experiments in administration; having passed the best years of my life in administration, I naturally have more faith in gradual and cautious progress in the lines which have been already laid down.

VILLAGE UNIONS

Gentlemen, I will begin with villages—because, as I have already said, in India the villager represents the

nation. In village administration there is no touch between the rulers and the people, the only link between the administrators and the people in Civil administration is the hated link of the Police. It is a misfortune and an administrative mistake that our District Officers should have so little direct touch with the villagers and their natural leaders, and should work so entirely through the Police. If there is distress in the land, the Police makes enquiries; if there is cholera epidemic in the land, the Police distributes cholera pills; if a village tank has given way or the village water-supply dried up, the Police reports and organises help; if a tree has been blown down and obstructs a village path (I have seen instances of this myself), the villagers are powerless to help themselves until the Police comes and removes the obstruction. It seems to be a mockery that the very country which was the first to organise village communities, village panchayats, and village self-government, and cherished these institutions for 3,000 years, should be rendered so absolutely helpless, and should be ruled through the undesirable agency of the Police. Gentlemen, the mistake has been discovered and Village Unions have been formed or are in the course of formation in most provinces in India. Make these Village Unions real centres of village administration in so far as is consistent with good government. Parcel out each sub-division into twenty or thirty Village Unions, entrust the Union Committees with the charge of village roads, village tanks, village drainage, village education, and village hospitals, and send over to them all petty Civil and Criminal cases, not for judicial disposal, but for amicable settlement. A great deal of expensive litigation and bad feeling into villages can thus be stopped, a great deal of useful work can thus be done, and what is more, the natural leaders of the village population will thus come in touch with the sub-divisional and district administrators, and will form the agents of village administration in so far as they are fit to take that position. An unsympathetic system of rule through the Police will thus be replaced by a rule with the co-operation of the people themselves.

MUNICIPAL TOWNS

From the subject of villages, I come to the subject of Municipal Towns which are receiving a great deal of attention now. Gentlemen, I consider it of primary importance that we should insist on efficient Municipal administration, and that power should be given to the Government to ensure such efficient administration if the Municipal Commissioners are slack. Such power is retained by the Government in England, and it is more necessary that such power should be retained by the Government in India. But having provided for this, I am of opinion that the work should be done through the elected Commissioners and not through officials or secretaries appointed by the Government. The latter system ruins self-government, and is not needed. I have myself supervised the work of every Municipality in a District as a District Officer, and I have supervised the work of all the Municipalities in a Division as a Divisional Commissioner. The Municipal Commissioners were sometimes zealous and sometimes slack, sometimes they went the right way and sometimes the wrong way ; but I have never found them obstructive I have never found them averse to sanitary improvement or general progress ; I have never found them other than amenable to reason and advice. With some tact and patience and sympathy we can get all that we want to do through the men elected by the people themselves ; and it is unwise and undesirable, it is a confession of our own incompetency and want of sympathy, to try to replace the elective system by men appointed by the Government to do Municipal work in the small district towns of India. The aptitude of self-government in towns and villages is, in India, a heritage of 3,000 years, and to seek to ignore it is an administrative blunder, and a confession of our own incompetency.

DISTRICT BOARDS

Coming next to the subject of District Boards, the question is often asked why non-official chairmen should not be appointed over these Boards. The reason, Gentlemen,

in the generality of cases, is that non-official gentlemen who know their own villages and estates will have not the same knowledge of the district as a whole as the District Officer. We must, above all, insist on efficient work being done—and generally the District Officer is the only man who can, in the ordinary course of his tours, supervise and secure efficient work throughout his district. At the same time I would not make any hard and fast rule; and where we have retired Government servants or private gentlemen who know their districts well, and who have the capacity and the time for administrative work, it would be a gain and not a loss to our administration to see such gentlemen appointed Chairmen of District Boards; and I sincerely hope to see a beginning made by the Government in this direction. Another question which is often discussed in connection with District Boards is the poverty of their income. This, Gentlemen, is a real and a grave evil; and it has become not only desirable but necessary that for large provincial schemes of irrigation and drainage, the resources of the District Board should be supplemented by provincial grants. You are aware how much good is done in these provinces by a system of irrigation wells; and there is no reason why the work of the maintenance of a sufficient number of such wells and other works for the prevention of famines should not be made over to the District Board on allotments made by the Provincial Government. In Bengal, the crying evil is bad drainage, which causes that malaria which is the curse of one-half of the Province. There is no reason why a provincial grant should not be made to every District Board for the proper drainage of the district. Gentlemen, I have said it elsewhere that the money spent on one needless trans-frontier war, if spent in improving the drainage of Bengal, would save millions of the people permanently from one of the direct curses of the present age. My advice is: make the District Boards real agents of beneficent administration with the co-operation of the people; don't strangle them by the shackles of officialism; don't starve them by want of funds.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

And now, Gentlemen, I come to the important subject of Provincial Legislative Councils, and on this subject also my suggestion will be to proceed on the lines already laid down, and not to take a new departure. The object of allowing District and Municipal bodies to elect members of these Councils was to allow the views of the people to be represented, and I think every responsible Administrator in India will admit that this wise step has improved and strengthened the legislative machinery of the Government. Even when the views of the elected members are rejected—and they are often rejected—even then the expression of their views is a gain to the cause of Administration. The time has now come when a fuller scope may be given to this expression of our views and the representation of our opinions. Half-a-dozen members, elected under somewhat complicated rules, can scarcely give expression to the views of the people of a Province with a population of thirty or forty millions or more. Is it too much to hope that in the not remote future the Government will find it possible to permit every district to be represented by its own member? I do not object to the number of official and nominated members being also increased; I do not object to Councils sitting five days or six days in the week instead of one day; and I do not object to the head of the Government reserving the power of vetoing a measure, even against the views of the majority of the Council, in urgent cases, as the Queen of England has theoretically the power to refuse her consent to a measure passed by both Houses. With these safeguards, I would suggest an expansion of the Provincial Councils on the basis of each district being represented by its member, so that there may be an adequate expression of the people's opinions and views on every question. We do not wish for the absolute control of the administration of the country, but we do demand an adequate means of placing our views before the Government before it decides on questions affecting our welfare.

. PROVINCIAL EXECUTIVE COUNCILS

But, Gentlemen, the Legislative Councils deal with legislation only, there are large and important measures of administration which do not come within the scope of these Councils. The weakness of the present system of Government is that in the decision on these administrative measures, the people have no voice and are not heard at all. To take one instance out of hundreds which will no doubt suggest themselves to you, the people of the Central Provinces of India had no constitutional means of declaring whether the Revenue Settlement should be for twenty or thirty years; whether the Government demand should be 50 per cent. of the Malguzars' assets or 60 per cent. *plus* 12 per cent. as rates; and the decision to which the Government arrived without the constitutional advice of the people has been disastrous. Gentlemen, this defect can be rectified, this weakness may be removed. There are Executive Councils in Bombay and in Madras; similar Executive Councils may be formed in the North-West Provinces and the Punjab, in the Central Provinces and in Bengal, and at least one Member of the Executive Council should be an Indian Gentleman with experience in administrative work, and representing the views of his countrymen. (*Applause.*) It is usual for a Member of an Executive Council to have a portfolio, *i.e.*, to have one department of work assigned to him; and the work which I would assign to the Indian Member is Land Revenue, Industries and Agriculture. There is no department of work in which an Indian Member can make himself more useful, or make his services more valuable to the voiceless millions of cultivators and artisans. The addition of one Indian Member will not weaken Provincial administration; it will strengthen such administration, make it more sympathetic, and bring it into somewhat closer touch with the people.

THE VICEROY'S EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

And, Gentlemen, am I aspiring too high when I hope for similar seats for Indian Members in the cloudy heights of Imperial Simla? Am I urging anything unreasonable

when I propose that the Viceroy, who has the benefit of consulting experienced English Administrators in his Executive Council, should also have the advantage of hearing the views and opinions of a few Indian Members in the same Council before he decides on questions affecting the interests of the people of India? Am I urging anything unwise when I propose that the Viceroy, when he considers measures affecting the condition of the indebted cultivators, the operations of plague and famine relief, the rules of Land Revenue Settlements, the questions affecting Hindu and Mahomedan customs and manners, should have by him, in his own Executive Council, a few Indian Gentlemen who represent the views, the opinions and the feelings of the people? An Executive Council cannot be much enlarged without loss of efficiency; but surely the Viceroy's Council could make room for three Indian Gentlemen, one to represent Bengal and Assam, another to represent the North-West and the Punjab, and the third to represent Bombay, Madras and the Central Provinces. The selection should rest, of course, with the Viceroy himself, for anything like election into an Executive Council would be absurd; and the three Indian Members should be entrusted with the departments of Agriculture, Industries and Land Revenue of their respective Provinces. The wise and magnanimous Akbar entrusted his Land Revenue arrangements to Todar Mall; and the British Government may consider it wise and statesmanlike to avail itself of the experience of Indian gentlemen in controlling Land Revenue Settlements, and generally in improving the condition of the voiceless and impoverished cultivators and manufacturers of India. I myself think that the Administration of the country would be vastly improved by such representation of Indian opinions in our highest Councils, and that the Government of India and the Government of the Provinces would be brought in closer touch with the people. And, Gentlemen, I am very much mistaken in our present Viceroy if His Excellency does not himself sincerely desire to mark his administration by some measures which will bring the rulers in closer touch with the people.

PROGRESS IN THE FUTURE

And now, Gentlemen, it only remains for me to thank you once more for the great honor you have done me by electing me to preside on this occasion, and for the kind and patient hearing you have given me. I have been somewhat of an optimist all my life, I have a belief in progress, I have faith in the British Government, I have lived and worked in that faith and I should like to die in that faith. The experiment of Administration *for the people*, not *by the people*, was tried in every country in Europe in the last century, by some of the best intentioned sovereigns that ever lived who are known in history as the Benevolent Despots of the 18th Century. The experiment failed because it is an immutable law of Nature that you cannot permanently secure the welfare of people, if you tie up the hands of the people themselves. (*Applause.*) Every country in Europe recognises this truth now, and England foremost of all. Every English Colony has obtained a system of Self-Government, and from being discontented and disaffected they are now the strongest supporters of the British Empire. And a system of complete Self-Government in local affairs was conceded to Ireland by the present Government less than two years ago, when Lord Curzon was a distinguished Member of that Government. The conditions of India are different, and I admit freely and fully that we want a strong centralised Government here; and if the moderate scheme I have proposed tended in any way to weaken the Indian Government, the proposal, Gentlemen, would not have come from me. But I have discussed the subject with many eminent Englishmen, now in England and possessing vast experience in Indian Administration, and I have asked them to reject my scheme if they thought it would weaken the Indian Government instead of greatly strengthening it. Gentlemen, I have never been told in reply that the scheme would weaken the Government. It is isolation, it is exclusiveness, it is want of touch with the people, which weakens British Rule in India (*hear, hear*) and my desire is to strengthen that rule by bringing it in touch with the

people, by enlisting the zealous co-operation of a great and loyal nation.

Permit me, Gentlemen, to refer for a moment to my own experience as a District Officer. You are aware that a District Officer is liable to frequent transfers; and I was sometimes in charge of districts where 75 per cent. of the people were Hindus, and at other times of districts where 75 per cent. were Mahomedans. I may remark in passing that everywhere I received the cordial co-operation of the people in my administrative work, and the sympathy and support, which I received from Mahomedan zemindars and the Mahomedan population generally, enabled me to administer with some degree of success such vast and difficult districts as Backergunj and Mymensingh. But what I wish specially to mention is that in these Mahomedan districts, the Government always employed a number of able Mahomedan Deputy Collectors to advise and help the District Officer in his work; and in all questions relating to the social and economic conditions of the Mahomedan people, and to their public feelings and religious sentiments, I received the most valuable help and advice from my Mahomedan colleagues in the work of administration. Gentlemen, the duties and responsibilities of a District Officer are humble compared to the manifold duties and high responsibilities of a Viceroy or the Governor of a Province; and I therefore often ask myself if those statesmen do not sometimes feel, as we humble District Officers always felt, that it would help and improve administration to have a few true representatives of the people by their side and in their Executive Councils. And I cannot help replying to myself that the advice and help of some Indian colleagues would greatly strengthen the hands of wise and sympathetic statesmen in solving the great problems which lie before them, none of which is more momentous and more pressing than the condition of the Indian agriculturist and the Indian manufacturer.

Gentlemen, from whatever point of view I examine the question, whether in the light of European history, or of the spirit of British institutions, or of the requirements

for good government for India, I feel convinced that to associate the people of India more largely in shaping the administration of the country is not only the wisest but the only possible path before us. It is true we have not been moving onwards in this path in recent years; we have actually stepped backwards in these years of misfortunes and calamities and panic; we have even been deprived of those rights and privileges which we secured in years of wise and sympathetic administration. But such years of retrograde movement come to all nations from time to time, even to those who are most advanced. Remember England at the close of the last century, when to talk of political reforms was punished as sedition and crime, when coercive measures were passed to stop public meetings, when reactionary laws were enacted to restrict the liberties of Englishmen. The panic passed away after the Napoleonic wars were over, and the Reform came in 1832. The reactionary period through which we are passing will end before long, and wise English statesmen will perceive in the future, as they have perceived in the past, that England's duty and England's interests are the same in India, to consolidate British Rule by extending, not restricting, self-government, by conciliating, not alienating, a loyal and a grateful nation.

Gentlemen, it is possible to prevent distress and disasters and deaths from famines, to spread prosperity and contentment, and to evoke the zealous and loyal support of a grateful nation, only by conceding to the people,—in so far as is safely possible,—the blessings of self-government. Gentlemen, it is not possible, without this concession, without admitting the people to a real share in the control of their own concerns, to save India from distress and discontent and deaths from famines. Therefore, as an old and faithful and retired servant of the Indian Government, I have thought it my duty to raise my voice to urge the adoption of the better and the wiser course,—the only course which can save my countrymen from preventible famines and deaths, and can consolidate British Rule in India. (*Loud and continued cheers.*)

Sixteenth Congress—Lahore—1900

MR. N. G. CHANDAVARKAR

INTRODUCTION

MR. ROY, members of the Reception Committee, brother-delegates, friends and fellow-countrymen, ladies and gentlemen,—I am speaking to you from the bottom of my heart when I say that I regard this as the proudest moment of my life. (*Cheers.*) I can find no expression adequate enough to convey to you my sense of gratitude at the overwhelming kindness with which you have treated me. All I can say on the present occasion is to thank you, my fellow-countrymen, from the bottom of my heart, for the very high honour which you have conferred upon me by electing me to the office and for the very great kindness with which you have treated me not only on this occasion but ever since my arrival in Lahore. Ladies and Gentlemen and Brother Delegates,—the nomination of a President for the Indian National Congress is annually followed with deep interest throughout the country, and till last year your choice fell upon men whose claim to your suffrages was far greater than mine. It was, therefore, with a feeling of considerable diffidence that I accepted the invitation to become your President. I am deeply sensible of the responsibilities of the opinion which your goodwill has now assigned to me, and of my own shortcomings. Your summons, calling me to this duty, was served on me rather late when there was not much time left for me to get ready for the work; but I have obeyed your call, for I regard it as the country's call. I am in your hands; take me as I am with all my defects. All

I can say in profound acknowledgment of the confidence which you have reposed in me is that I will try my best to deserve it.

Diffident as I am, I draw hope and inspiration for the proper discharge of my duties from those I see before me. There is something elevating in the remembrance of the fact that you on whose deliberations I have to preside are all earnest men, animated by a pure love of their country. And with your support and sympathy I hope I shall not prove unworthy of the great honour you have done me—an honour which I value all the more because it has fallen to my share to sit here at Lahore in the Presidential Chair as the successor of that noble-minded man—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. This is the First Congress that I attend after an absence of ten years, having attended all the previous Congresses, and though I have never been alienated from it I cannot conceal from you my feeling that I return to my old love. If what the poet says is true that “short absence urges sweet return”, how much sweeter is the return when the absence is long?

CONGRESS—THE POLITICAL CONSCIENCE OF THE COUNTRY

I look back and find that in ten years the Congress movement has gathered strength and force, which is very reassuring. Time was when your President had at these gatherings to devote the best portion of his inaugural address to certain criticisms against the Congress, and to deal with a certain kind of opposition, ridicule, and misunderstanding to which our movement stood exposed. Our right to call ourselves “national,” “loyal,” and so on was questioned; but that is all more or less past history. We do not now hear much of the old cries that raged round our heads—or, if we hear something of them now and then, they are more or less faint echoes of decaying creeds which serve to remind us that the Congress has, in spite of them, grown and marched on; and if I were asked how we stand at this moment, I should say that the Indian National Congress, having outlived the stage of active

opposition, entered on the era of achievement when the Legislative Councils were expanded, and the Welby Commission was appointed, and now it has arrived at a period when more than ever it can justify its existence as the political conscience of the country.

FAMINE OF 1899

For, just look about and examine the circumstances under which we meet here. Since you last met under the presidency of that good man and true—Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt—the country has passed through a calamity the severest of its kind. No less an authority than the noble statesman who is now at the head of our Government has spoken of it as a “famine, which, within the range of its incidence, has been the severest that India has ever known.” (*Cheers.*) The country has suffered from two famines which have followed in swifter succession than any two previous ones and, great as has been the misery, acute as has been the suffering they have entailed upon the people, they have at the same time served as object-lessons by bringing responsible statesmanship nearer than ever to a consciousness of the gravity and urgency of the great problem, which the Indian National Congress has been pressing on the attention of our Rulers from the very day of its birth, sixteen years ago, in Bombay. That problem could not be expressed in more definite and appropriate language than was used when the Second Session of the Indian National Congress, which met at Calcutta at the end of the year 1886 under the presidency of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji—that Nestor of Indian politicians—passed its second resolution in these terms :—

That this Congress regards with the deepest sympathy, and views with grave apprehension, the increasing poverty of vast numbers of the population of India.

At every subsequent Session of the Congress, stress was laid upon the grave character of the problem, resolutions were passed and speeches made, pointing out the seriousness of the situation caused by the increasing poverty of the masses in India. But it takes long for

the reforming spirit to move, and great movements, pledged to principles which are opposed to current ideas, have sometimes to wait till Providence itself has to take their side. In their case history repeats itself in a manner in which it perhaps rarely repeats itself in other cases. You all remember the history of the Free Trade agitation in England. Speaking many years ago on the subject, the late Mr. Bright said that the Free Traders had to carry on their agitation under tremendous difficulties, and it was only when famine stalked throughout the land and Providence came to their help that the responsible statesmen of the country became converts to the Free Trade gospel, and Mr. Cobden won his cause. We find ourselves in a somewhat similar situation now in this country. The last two famines have in a way brought Providence to our help; it has taken up the cry of the Congress, and it seems as though you heard from everywhere—"The Congress is coming to be right after all." For, when the Viceroy had to say in his last "Statement on Famine" of a province like Gujarat, generally considered rich, that "the weakness and incapacity for resistance of the people took the Local Government by surprise," we may fairly say that the position taken up by the Congress from the beginning "about the increasing poverty of vast numbers of the population of India" is being practically recognised by those who hold the destinies of this country in their hands.

STATE FAMINE POLICY

I do not wish by any means to affirm that the Government had ignored the problem altogether in the past, or that it had been altogether unmindful of its gravity. Nor is it my intention to assert that it had hitherto done nothing to cope with it. If I said that, I should be doing injustice to the memory of those British statesmen who have repeatedly called attention to it, and have in their own way devised or suggested remedies. One has only to read the writings and speeches of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji to find out that in calling attention to the poverty question in India during the last twenty years, if not more, he has taken his stand, among other

things, on the authority of several British Indian officials and administrators. But my point is this, that the Government has not approached its solution in a broad, comprehensive, masterly spirit, worthy of British statesmanship and worthy of so great an Empire as that of Her Majesty's in India. The policy it has pursued in dealing with the problem and attempting its solution has been a policy of what Lord Rosebery would call "patches". And we need not be surprised at that, however much we may deplore it. There is indeed much in the British character which justly calls for admiration and appreciation. Its genius is practical; its devotion to duty, its sympathy for suffering, and its practical benevolence, as the last famine administration has shown, are unflinching and unswerving—and it has "the old strength to dominate circumstances". This is its strength but, as often happens, what is our strength becomes at times our weakness. A people whose genius is practical, and whose saving quality is the capacity to be roused in the face of an intolerable evil, is apt to let things slide until they cause suffering, which might have been by wise foresight and judicious management prevented. And this is what has often happened both in England and in India. What Lord Rosebery complained of nearly a year ago in the case of administration in England holds good in the case of administration in India also.

"I humbly think," said his Lordship, "that in this country"—meaning England—"we live a great deal too much from hand to mouth . . . We are a people of enormous waste. We waste simply by not pursuing scientific methods."

One has only to look back to see how true this is when applied to the policy that has been pursued in dealing with the agrarian problem in particular in India. So long ago as January 1883, so sober and thoughtful a journal as the *Spectator* of London said:

All accounts, independent and official, show that the ultimate difficulty of India, the economic situation of the cultivator, is coming to the front in a most disheartening way, and is exciting among the most experienced officials a sensation of positive alarm.

And then it went on to say what illustrates the point I am now making that the Government in India are faced "by a compulsion to pass small measures when they know that only large measures could succeed and doubt their right to sanction them". To take one of several instances, for years before 1875 the indebtedness of the Deccan ryot had been a theme of loud complaint in the Public Press and elsewhere, but it was only when the *ryot* in sheer desperation took the law into his own hands, and cut off the noses of his Marwari money-lenders, that the Government of Bombay woke up to the situation, and appointed a Commission to inquire into it. When the Commission, among other things, reported about the rigidity of the land revenue system, the Government left that larger question aside, and went to tackle the money-lender.

THE RIGIDITY OF THE LAND REVENUE SYSTEM

We had the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act passed to put restrictions on the money-lender. That was equity to some extent, but it was what Sir Raymond West called in his comments on the working of the Act some years afterwards "lop-sided equity", for as he put it:

The ryot must pay the tax-gatherer, but as to other creditors the law protects him from the obligation of meeting his liabilities.

But the Government stood by its guns so far as its own land-revenue system was concerned. It defended that system, and we find a year after, the Act I speak of came into force, Dr. Pollen, now retired, who was appointed to administer the provisions of the Act, reporting as follows:

No steps that I am aware of have yet been taken that the revenue demand should be so timed and adjusted as not to drive the ryot to the sowcar, even temporarily, in order to meet it.

I do not wish to dogmatise on the effects of this Act, for I know there are officials who hold—and their testimony is entitled to weighty and respectful consideration—that it has brought some comfort to the ryot. But as a British Revenue Official of the Bombay Presidency

put it in recording his experiences of the Act, by it "debtors are comforted, creditors are tormented". But the mischief of the rigidity of the land-revenue system was left untouched. That is an instance of passing what the *Spectator* of London called in 1883 "small measures". And this small measure has now saved the Deccan ryot from falling an easy prey to famine visitations. Mr. Justice Ranade, who was in favour of the Act, and I had a great deal to do in administering its provision before he was raised to the Bench, was cautious enough to say to his Report in 1881 :

Of course, a famine visitation would expose the people's solvency to a test.

Since then two famines have put it to the test—and we know with what results. Another illustration of this policy is afforded by the complaint of the Hon'ble Mr. Nicholson that though during the last thirty years there have been connected with agriculture numerous Conferences, Committees, Reports, and Resolutions, yet nothing has been done. Ten years ago an Agricultural Committee appointed by the Government of Madras suggested the establishment of agricultural schools and farms in half-a-dozen stations to start with. The Government of India took the question out of the hands of the Local Government, and did not arrive at any final decision for some years. In the case of the Poorundhur Bank Scheme, the Secretary of State took the matter out of the hands of the Government of India and the Bombay Government, and refused to allow the experiment to be tried on a small scale. This illustrates one of the obstacles to the carrying out of agricultural reform. The Local Governments have to obtain the approval of the Government of India to their schemes, and they have to wait until the latter authority has had time to consider them and hit upon a scheme which will be suitable to all parts of the Indian continent. As has been well remarked, "Indian official life is short, but Indian discussions are long", and officers who have expended much thought in elaborating schemes of reform

have seldom a chance of seeing their labours turned to practical account. When they retire from the Service their places are taken by others, who have not the same knowledge or interest in the subject. For instance, Mr. Nicholson has devoted his attention to the question of agricultural banks; but it is only now when he has but a few years of official life left in India, that he is appointed a Member of a Committee on the subject. More instances of this policy could be cited—a policy which has hesitated to deal with the agrarian problem in a through-going, broad, and statesmanlike spirit. What occurs to one on this subject is the question: Cannot each Presidency be allowed to work out its salvation in the matter of agricultural reform in the way it thinks best? Surely one would suppose, that a Presidency has large enough area for this purpose, and it is only by instituting a large number of experiments that the true method can be found. If this were done, there would be healthy rivalry between the several Presidencies, and they would profit by the failure and successes of one another.

The fact is, it has been more or less a policy of drift; it has left an evil to grow till it became acute, and then it has tried to grapple with it on the surface, and that too by fits and starts. India, we are told, is and ought to be above party politics, and we admit that there is no sounder maxim for administrative guidance.

But if we have been above party politics, we have not escaped being the victims of petty politics. The problem is great, but the measures hitherto adopted for its solution have been small.

"India House Traditions," wrote the late Sir James Fitz James Stephen in his *Essays on 'Ecclesiastical Biography'* published in 1849 "tell that when a young aspirant for distinction there requested one of the Chaihrs to inform him what was the proper style of writing political dispatches, the Chair made answer: '*The style we prefer is the humdrum.*'"

And it is the humdrum style that has been adopted, generally speaking, in dealing with what now has become a very serious problem—the poverty of the people. It is

no use crying, however, over spilt milk. Both the Government and the people have to co-operate in right earnest and to look ahead. The question now is, "Is the policy of the future to be one of drift, or of wise, well-regulated direction?" There are signs and indications already that the policy of drift will not be the policy of the future, but that there will be a serious attempt to deal with the problem of poverty and famine prevention in a broad, statesmanlike and courageous manner.

LORD CURZON ON FAMINE

We have now at the helm of the Government of India a statesman, of whom we may justly say that he promises to be all that a Viceroy of India ought to be. (*Cheers.*) That he has won the hearts of the people and that the people trust in him goes without saying, and the enthusiastic receptions he met with during his recent tour bear unmistakable testimony to his growing popularity. Lord Curzon has won the hearts of the people, because since he came amongst us as our Viceroy, he has been more than a mere abstraction—he has been a flesh-and-blood Viceroy, who, whether he issues resolutions, or makes speeches on State matters, seems to the people that he addresses them and desires to take them into his confidence, and make his presence, his personality, and his energy felt throughout the land. (*Hear, hear.*) His Excellency made a Statement on famine early in October last, and the assurance he then gave, after describing the woeful state to which the country had been reduced by the calamity, is assuring. He said that the Government would "not sit idle until the next famine comes, and then bewail the mysteries of Providence". It is not the Viceroy's sympathy alone that has been aroused by the famine that we have passed through. As has been remarked in many a quarter, one bright spot in the dark scene of the last famine is that it has served to draw closer the British officials and the people. Every word of what Lord Curzon said in his Statement on famine in cordial acknowledgment of "the administrative knowledge, the unflagging energy, and the devotion of the British officers" is endorsed

throughout the country. These officers have worked silently amidst heart-rending scenes, and have now experienced more than ever that such suffering as the people have had to endure has been the acutest of its kind. Moreover, the great heart of the British Nation has been moved by the calamity, and its benevolence as also the benevolence of America and some other countries has realised our position and come to our aid. But one is forcibly reminded here of the great dictum of the late Mr. Bright that it is not *benevolence* but *justice* alone which can cope with gigantic evils; and may we not reasonably hope that sympathy so aroused will not fade before the problem forced on its attention by the last famine is solved in a spirit worthy of Imperial statesmanship?

CERTAIN ALLEGED CAUSES OF FAMINE.

There are two or three notions of which we have to get rid before the problem of agrarian indebtedness and poverty in India is approached. That famines occur because the monsoon fails no one denies. In a sense they are inevitable in India; but no more inevitable, for instance, than in Ireland or Egypt. If the latter country was able to tide over this year of the lowest Nile in the century without a famine, why should not India be able to do the same when the rainfall fails? No famine policy is worth the name which does not discard the pusillanimous doctrine that famines are inevitable and that, therefore, not much can be done. The question which has been forcing itself on the attention of all serious thinkers and responsible Administrators is not—Why do famines occur? but—Why do they occur in *increasing* severity, and why is the *staying power* of the people growing down? I do not think that anybody seriously believes in the *population* theory which is so often propounded in certain quarters as an answer to the question. There are a score of countries where population has been increasing much faster than in India, and yet they have not been struck down by the phenomenal poverty which is staring us in the face in this country. Sir Robert Giffen, speaking recently before the Manchester Statistical

Society on the achievements of the 19th century which is now closing, pointed out the prodigious rate at which the community of European nations had grown and was growing. The other notion is that we are a nation of spendthrifts, and that our ryots in particular fall easy victims to bad times because they do not save. There are eminent authorities, official and non-official, who have from their experience of the people in general and the ryots in particular challenged the correctness of that view. The average English labourer is not known to be more provident than the Indian ryot, who has, further, this natural advantage in his favour that he requires less food, fewer necessities of life by way of clothing. If he spends on marriages more than he ought to, the benefit of such mild extravagance goes to other ryots of his class and goes not without return. What is spent on marriages is mostly in the shape of ornaments—and ornaments serve as a resource to fall back upon in times of distress. This was pointed out in the case of the ryots of the Deccan by the Deccan Ryots' Commission, and I see that the Hon'ble Mr. B. K. Bose, who is known to measure his words carefully, says the same on the authority of those who ought to know in the case of the agricultural classes of the Central Provinces. If further proof were wanted of the extravagance of the accusation brought against the ryot, we have it afforded by an observation made by His Excellency the Viceroy from his place in the Viceregal Legislative Council some months ago. His Excellency computed the gross annual agricultural produce of the Indian Empire to be worth 400 crores of rupees, which give Rs. 20 per head as the gross annual income of the agricultural classes. Out of this, nearly Rs. 1-8 go in payment of the Government assessment on land, and of the balance Rs. 1-8 in payment of indirect taxation. We may safely challenge those who talk of the ryot's extravagance to point out another peasant in the world who can maintain himself on Rs. 17 per annum. (*Cheers.*) And yet he is expected to make a saving out of it! Whatever else our ryots may be, they are not a nation of spendthrifts. The national ideal is one of asceticism, not athleticism, and our people live very much up to it. That in

itself would be an answer to the charge of extravagance. But even assuming that the ryot does spend something on marriages, it cannot be very much after all and surely life must be made not only tolerable but a little pleasant even to the Indian cultivator. If, in his case, we cannot, as the late Mr. Gladstone desired in the case of the British workman, level up his status so as to enable him to have a piano in his cottage, we need not at least grudge him some expense on marriage and other festive occasions which add charm to life.

MONEY LENDERS AND LAW COURTS

The problem is no doubt complicated, but much depends on the view which a ruler takes of the possibilities and limitations of the power of Government to benefit the people. It is just possible to exaggerate the one or the other. Those who hold exaggerated notions of the possibilities regarding them as equivalent to those of Divine Providence are doomed to discomfiture; but this at any rate must be said for them that they "will not bind their soul with clay". Those, on the other hand, who exaggerate the limitation of human Governments are those to whom hope never comes, and who can only plunge a race or a nation deeper into the depths of misery and despondency than they found it. It is encouraging to find that our present Viceroy has no superstitious belief in the virtues of official action. At the same time he is not a fatalist in the matter of administration. No one pretends—and if any one does, there are very few of the class—that agrarian indebtedness is due solely to any particular cause. What is complained of is that the Government has but touched the fringe of the subject hitherto in dealing with the question of its solution. For instance, take the question of the share which the money-lender on the one hand and our law courts on the other are said to have had in deepening the ryot's poverty. The money-lender is not a creature entirely of the British Government, but as years ago Sir Erskine Perry, once Chief Justice of Bombay pointed out, whereas before the advent of the British in India the money-lender was either some Bania or Brahmin of the village, whose interests and fortunes were

identified with those of the ryots to whom he lent ; after that the Marwari adventurer took his place. The ryot did, and does, require protection from the grasping money-lender, but it is admitted on all hands that he cannot do without the money-lender altogether. Now, we may fairly ask this question : Have the attempts hitherto made to save the ryot from the money-lender's clutches proved the ryot's salvation ? Take the case of the law to which I have above referred—the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act passed in 1879. Its main object has been to save the Deccan ryots from the exactions of money-lenders and to prevent in that way lands from passing from the former to the latter. There is a suggestion now that the Act which applies to some of the districts of the Bombay Presidency should be extended to all. But those of us who have had to do with the course of litigation under the Act have reason to fear that the relief which is given by the Act to the ryot is more apparent than real. The ryot is allowed to sue his money-lender without any charge for court fee for his litigation. The Court scrutinises his dealings with his creditors with a great deal of jealousy, and helps him to get his land freed from exorbitant demands. That is so far for the good of the ryot, but does the good go to him ? What professional men like myself, having to deal with cases under the Act, often find is that the ryot is only the man who figures on the scene ; but behind him is some one fighting his battle, spending the money for him, carrying on the litigation, and getting probably all the benefit of the Act intended to save the ryot. The Act in fact substitutes one creditor for another ; but all the same the ryot is not saved. This is a point which has struck nearly all those who have any experience of litigation connected with the Act. It is my impression—and the impression of several of my brother pleaders—gathered in the course of professional business. It is said that the tendency of the ryot to have "frequent intercourse to the law courts"—I borrow the words used by His Excellency the Viceroy in his reply to the address of the Mahajana Sabha of Madras the other day—has contributed to his impoverishment. The Hon'ble Mr. Toynbee drew

the attention of the Government to this phase of the problem during the discussion on the last Budget in the Viceroy's Legislative Council—to the steady increase which is taking place year by year in the Government revenue from court fees and the enormity of the law charges. He said: "The character of our courts is a cause of our poverty." Undoubtedly it is a striking fact that large and highly paid judicial establishments are kept up to deal with litigation, the bulk of which, *i.e.*, over 60 per cent. as an examination of the statistics shows, concerns property or transactions worth less than Rs. 50. But this character of our litigation is not so much a cause as an indication of the poverty of the country, showing how small the transactions of the community are. It is proposed to pass a law for the *motussil* on the lines of the Arbitration Act which applies to Presidency Towns. That is a good move in the right direction and may help the ryot to some extent, but will not save him from his load of indebtedness.

LAND ALIENATION BILL

That brings me to the principle of a law which has recently been passed for the Punjab, and the application of which to other parts of the country is said to be under the consideration of the Government. The object of his law is to restrict the ryot's power of alienation. It is not possible to foresee the consequences of it, and we know that it encountered strenuous opposition in its passage through the Viceregal Legislative Council. Both the mover of the Punjab Land Alienation Bill and His Excellency the Viceroy have claimed for it no more than that, it is a bold experiment based on the principle that "he who never risks anything never wins anything". But assuming that the experiment will succeed, it will only serve to tie the ryot to the land—a very good object to gain so far; but to tie the ryot to the land is one thing, and to enable him to live and flourish on it is another. Such measures may be good and useful as far as they go as *palliatives*. But after all is done by way of palliatives for the ryot's relief, his poverty will remain and the evil of agrarian indebtedness may still

stare us in the face like the goblin in the German legend, who, as soon as the peasant had burnt his house down to get rid of him, reappeared amidst the saved furniture, and lustily shouted out : "*Lo ! I am still here !*" (Laughter.)

LAND REVENUE SETTLEMENT

The feeling largely shared in the country is, that side by side with all these palliative measures it is necessary to relax the rigidity of the land revenue system. (*Cheers.*) Mr. Dutt dealt with this subject in his last year's presidential address, and the Hon'ble Mr. Mehta for Bombay, and the Hon'ble Mr. Bose for the Central Provinces, drew pointed attention to it in their speeches on the last Budget at a meeting of the Viceroy's Legislative Council. His Excellency the Viceroy has more than once assured that this important subject is now engaging his "independent investigation". But His Excellency put the question to the Mahajana Sabha of Madras the other day :

Supposing that we did reduce the assessment throughout India by 25 per cent., is there a man among you who would guarantee me that he honestly believed that there would be no more famine, no more poverty, no more distress,

No one would be so bold as to give a guarantee on that condition, and no one, I take it, thinks that a mere reduction by 25 per cent. in the assessment throughout India will stamp out poverty, for the poor will always be with us. But what is put forward is, that if the assessment be reduced 25 per cent. in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies and in the Central Provinces, where revision assessments have been raised more than 25 per cent., the relief given will be sufficient to dispense with the necessity of direct famine relief to that extent. At present where Government levy high assessments in good years, they have to refund the sums so levied by opening relief works when famine visits the land. The rigidity of the land revenue system, its uncertainties and vagaries are questions which must be tackled side by side with the other phases of the problem, and then some step will have been taken in the attempt to help the ryot in coping with famine or distress. The ryot may be right, or the ryot may be wrong, but the-

fact is there, attested now and then by Survey Settlement Officers that the periodic revision of settlements has a nervous effect on the ryot. As an instance, I will take that of the Kallyan Taluka in the Bombay Presidency, as to which we gather from its last Settlement Report that at the last revision survey it was found that garden cultivation had considerably decreased.

In superior soils, and where sufficient moisture is retained for second crops, they are grown to some extent, but not as much as might be.

That is the tale told, and in accounting for it, one Survey Officer concerned in the revision settlement ascribed it to "the laziness and lethargy of the cultivators", but another Officer "to the advent of the revision survey for fear that the existence of the second crops would lead to a higher estimate being made of the capabilities of their lands". The ryot was not lazy and lethargic formerly when garden cultivation flourished; its subsequent decrease can only be due to the cause suggested by the Survey Officer—the fear of the ryot that improvement means more assessment. That is the crux of the problem. The situation would be comical, were it not serious. When the Deccan Ryots' Commission was appointed to devise measures for the relief of indebtedness, two of its members condemned the Bombay Land Revenue system—and they were officers belonging to Northern India, and, therefore independent so far as the Bombay Presidency went. Mr. Rogers, who, on the other hand, was a Bombay Civilian, has been defending the Bombay system, but condemning the Madras system, and he seems to doubt if the Central Provinces system is all right. That points a moral, and shows that even independent official opinion is not unanimous on this much-vexed question. We rest satisfied for the present, however, with the assurance given by Lord Curzon that the subject is under his consideration.

A SYMPATHETIC AGRICULTURAL POLICY

All that we plead for is a more systematic, sympathetic agricultural policy than has been pursued. Government

have gone to the relief of the Bengal ryot and fixed the relations between him and his zemindar. Government are going to give relief to the ryot in Ratnagiri as against his *khot*. Why does it not examine more closely than it has done, and subject to a thorough impartial inquiry, its own relations towards its own tenants? Then, as to the improvement of agriculture. It was stated by the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson some months ago in reply to the Maharajah of Darbhanga that the Secretary of State had sanctioned the appointment of a Director to become the chief of a great Government organisation for affording assistance to the agricultural industry in this country. This we welcome as a hopeful assurance. That was the dream of Lord Mayo's wise and judicious administration, and it is known to all that Mr. Hume in Lord Mayo's time was appointed to organise an Agricultural Department for the improvement of agriculture. But one Viceroy succeeds another—and we drift. At one time the cry is taken up that the ryot's ways of cultivation require to be reformed. We hear it for a time, and then it is replaced by another cry that the ryot knows all about it and stands in no need of help. Now, the Indian ryot is neither a sinner nor saint in his business—he is neither stupid nor perfect. It is no use teaching him to give up his methods of cultivation wholesale. He is wiser than his teachers there. But at the same time the State may gently take him in hand, and help him to improve his industry by scientific methods where that can be done. And it can be done, provided the policy is pursued systematically and steadily. Let us hope that this new experiment which is to be made by the appointment of a Director of Agriculture for affording assistance to the agricultural industry of the country will be marked by a consistency of policy. We want not only a Director of Agriculture, but a Central Department of Agriculture and Industries.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

That brings me to the subject of industrial development—a subject on which I am rather afraid to speak

with the warning before me of Lord Curzon given the other day at Madras, that this subject of technical education or industrial development has "an extraordinary fascination for the tongue in India". I know that there are people who talk about it without knowing the real aspects of India's industrial situation—but after all the talkers may not be altogether a useless class. (*Cheers.*) In every country the talkers precede the actors at every stage of its progress. And, as the late Mr. Bright once put it:

I have observed that all great questions in this country require thirty hours of talk many times repeated before they are settled. There is much shower and much sunshine between the sowing of the seed and the reaping of the harvest, but the harvest is reaped generally after all.

And in India, where there is such a tendency to let things drift, there is no fear that talk may do no good—for that is one way of keeping the problem before us. The first Famine Commission declared that "the multiplication of industries was the only complete remedy for famine". That was twenty years ago. But since that report was made, very little has been done to advance the suggestion into the region of practice. On the contrary, some things have been done, unconsciously perhaps, which have had the effect of reducing the number of our industries. Is it any wonder that, under the circumstances, with millions of people coming on the land, millions of them should go out of it, and that Sir James Lyall and his colleagues on the second Famine Commission should find that numbers of the peasantry have been, and are being, reduced to landless day-labourers? These are the people whom a famine first touches, and who flock to relief-works the moment they are opened, and as they go on increasing in numbers, famine relief must soon out-turn the resources of Government. The present relief policy is doomed to early extinction, and already during the famine it has been stretched to breaking point. We are assured here again by Lord Curzon that as to this question of industrial development, "Government is

bestowing its serious attention upon the matter". His Excellency has, however, suggested the difficulty which stands in the way. Replying to Mahajana Sabha of Madras on this point, His Excellency asked :

Are you quite certain that those agencies and institutions which exercise so powerful a control upon the mind of the Indian youth are using their influence as they might do to encourage the particular form of education, which in theory they applaud ?

Now I do not wish for one moment to minimise this difficulty. That we have our part to do in this matter—to do our best to turn the mind of our youth to industrial channels rather than the seeking of merely literary education, and the courting of Government employment—is what I will freely admit. But what has happened in India by way of a tendency to seek literary education, and go in for Government employment, is what happened at one time in some countries in Europe, and what will happen in any country at first where schools are established and the improved machinery of official administration creates a large number of offices. Montalambert many years ago pointed that out in writing about some countries in Europe. The tendency will move in another direction—slowly, but steadily—if the initiative comes from the State as it has come in many other civilized countries. It is true that on the principle that while one man can lead a horse to drink water, even twenty cannot make it drink, Government may open schools for technical instruction, but they cannot get Indian youth to enter them if the youth will not enter, and that Government cannot create the spirit of enterprise where there is no desire for enterprise. But after all the mind of the Indian youth is not so hopelessly conservative and blindly stubborn. There are already signs that our educated men are not merely talking in the matter. As a Madras newspaper pointed out the other day in adverting to Lord Curzon's advice to the students at Cochin, there is a stream of tendency in the direction. What is claimed at the hands of Government is, that it should take advantage of this tendency and do all it can to help and forward it on. One way of helping

it on 'was pointed out by the *Indian Agriculturist* in March last. It said :

If we wish to see how a Government can help its subjects to solve this problem, we have only to look at what has been done in Canada, and is now being done in Ireland. In Canada, as we have more than once pointed out in these columns, the Agricultural Department acts on the principle that as it can command better brains than the individual farmer, its duty is to take the initiative, and to show the farmer how he can improve his methods and where he can find new sources of profit. If these new sources are beyond his unaided reach, the Department gives him a helping hand, but always on the understanding that as soon as the individual has secured a good grip of the new industry, he will do the rest of the work for himself. It is in this spirit that the Canadian Department of Agriculture has organised a cold storage service of train and steam-boat, so that butter and cheese can be sent in good condition from remote Canadian farms right away to Liverpool. As soon as the system is self-supporting and self-managing—an end already in sight—the Department will leave it alone, and go on to something else. The Irish Department of Agriculture has been planned with the same ends in view, but with this valuable addition that it is empowered to deal with manufacturing industries as well as agriculture.

Above all, no country in the economic and industrial condition of India has thriven under a *laissez faire* policy of commerce and agriculture. Even in England it was only in the middle of this century, when industries had grown to manhood, machinery had been invented, and manufactures had fully exhausted the advisability and needs of the old policy of protection, that, in response to the altered circumstances, the Free Trade policy was pursued. Now, I do not plead for Protection, for, if I did I should have to go back to the times when people had faith in it—and we do not live in those times. And even if we did ask for Protection, there is not the slightest chance that we shall get it. We have to deal with the question as a question of practical politics—and Protection is a creed that is obsolete and British statesmen will have none of it. And what Lord Salisbury said some twelve years ago is true. His Lordship said : “ My belief is that Protection means nothing else but Civil War.” But if the British manufacturer does not get Protection, he gets from the State something very much better in its stead—“ the open door ” or “ foreign markets ”. Now let that open-door policy;

be for the whole Empire, and let not Indian subjects going to Natal or Cape Colony be treated as if India had no part or lot in the Empire. (*Cheers.*) Nor should they be subjected to such restrictive rules as have been recently passed as regards the Roorkee College in India and Cooper's Hill in England. Let us have, secondly, an "open door" in our own country for our country's industry. The excise duty levied on the Bombay mill industry clearly shows that under the present policy, no Indian industry will be allowed to outgrow European competition.

ECONOMY IN ADMINISTRATION

But the solution of this problem which calls for remedies against famines will not complete unless they are made possible by a policy of wise and judicious economy in administration. Governments any more than individuals cannot both eat the cake and have it. The larger the proportion of revenue spent on the administration, the less of it there is to provide for the administered. It is encouraging to find that Lord Curzon has applied himself to this question also. Some years ago, no less an authority on Indian finance than Sir Auckland Colvin said in an article contributed to the columns of the *Nineteenth Century*—an article which created considerable interest at the time it appeared—that "there can be no improvement in Indian finance so long as Indian revenues are depleted by the claims of frontier extension". Soon after his assumption of the office of Viceroy, Lord Curzon addressed himself to this question, and his examination of the subject in relation to the financial condition of the country has resulted in what may be regarded as a wise compromise, the new policy being to irritate the susceptibilities of the frontier tribes as little as possible and to conciliate their goodwill. It is true the policy of subsidising these tribes may be carried too far, and these annually-recurring subsidies may in course of time mount up to the cost of a war. Besides, goodwill obtained by subsidies will have to be kept up by subsidies—and these may become a perpetual drain on the country. The success of the new policy

will have to depend mainly on the careful choice of the officers appointed to deal with and keep in hand the wild tribes on the frontier. Here it is mainly a question of "men, not measures". These rude, unsophisticated men adore a man that is true and brave, and discreet, and personal ascendancy so gained over them will be proof against the outburst of fanaticism more than anything else. But it is not on frontier exetensions alone that money has been wasted, I am prepared to make every allowance for expenditure to grow in these days of advancing civilisation and increased State responsibilities. But it should not in any case be allowed to outgrow the capacity of the country, and when it does, it makes a costly administration synonymous with a ruinous administration. Complaints have been made that while important works of public utility are postponed or declined, works of considerably less urgency are undertaken, and hastend on, without reference to the state of the treasury. An Anglo-Indian friend cited to me the other day what may appear a trifling instance, but what seems to me to be an apposite illustration of what I am submitting. He had always wondered, he said, how Government could sanction the erection of a costly building for a Military Mess in the Marine Lines on the Queen's Road in Bombay. While every pie the Government could spare was, it was said, wanted for plague and famine, here was a building rising in imposing greatness, and it stands there as one more proof of how economy is more preached than practised. There is the other thing—the importation of medical men from England for the purposes of plague. These may appear small matters, but these straws best show how the wind blows. Apart from individual instances there is a general tendency for the cost of the administration of the country to increase and it is a danger to be guarded against. If the country progressed in a corresponding measure, it will not much matter, but the country does not. The Welby Commission say that the cost of Civil Government increased during the period of 1883-84 to 1895-96 at a rate more than double that of the population during the same period, notwithstanding the re-imposition of the taxation remitted in-

previous years, and the addition of further new taxation at a rate only slightly in excess of the growth of the population. This means, to my mind, that while the prosperity of the nation has been practically at a standstill, the expenditure has grown by leaps and bounds. But it is somewhat encouraging to find that the Secretary of State for India has resolved and arranged to relieve India by £257,000 yearly, beginning on the 1st April next. Lord Curzon, we all feel, has begun well by setting his face against the policy of drift of which I have been speaking. But after all, Lord Curzon has come among us for five years, two of which have expired, and but three remain. Will British statesmanship drift into the old policy after him? It is here that our duty lies. The Congress has been from the beginning of its existence a standing protest against the policy of drift and the time is now come—it is now most opportune—when standing out more emphatically than ever, it ought to redouble its efforts, and help the Government in the solution of the great Indian problem to which all eyes are now turned. We belong to a movement which is the product of the genius of the British administration. It is a movement which is the natural outcome of the spirit of the age, and all that is best, noble and enduring in *Pax Britannica*, and the one duty that devolves on it is to stand forth and preach: "Not drift, but wise and sustained direction will save India."

REPRESENTATIVE AND CONSTITUTIONAL CONGRESS.

And in fulfilling this duty we have no reason to fear that we shall be suspected as noisy agitators who wish to embarrass rather than help the Government. We have moved on since it used to be said in some quarters that the educated native does not represent the people. That controversy is now a mere matter of history, or if it is not, I look upon it as a mere war of words. And so far as I have been able to gauge official opinion, the large majority of those who are responsible for the good administration of the country recognise the value of the opinion and influence of educated natives. And the very wise and statesmanlike observations made on this subject by

Lord Curzen in his reply to the address presented to him by the Municipal Corporation of Bombay ought to dispel all doubt on the point. And we have now arrived at the stage where the Congress has it in its power to make its usefulness felt by carrying on its work on its old-accustomed constitutional lines, by helping the Government with facts, with information, with practical suggestions, which will strengthen its hand, and enable it to pursue a policy of large and liberal measures and give up the tendency to drift in administration.

DUTIES OF CONGRESSMEN

This is the duty before us. It is that to which we have committed ourselves, and for the performance of which in the spirit of loyal adherence to the Throne of Her Majesty, we have here assembled. We know that the work before the Government—the task to which our Viceroy has devoted himself—is arduous and beset with difficulties, and that years must pass before the cause of reform wins. It is not for one man or even any body of men to say that he or they can finish the work and see his or their endeavours crowned with success. A learned divine has said, and said rightly: “One alone among the sons of men was able to say—*It is finished.*” But that British statesmanship has awakened to the gravity of the situation which envelopes the Indian problem is one of the most hopeful signs that the country has a better future before it, and the last famine—the disastrous suffering that it has brought to the people, the terrible strain it has put upon the officials and the marks it has left of misery and death—will not be altogether a calamity, if it keeps alive the conscience it has so signally served to awaken. All this should hearten us for the future. It should encourage us to devote ourselves to our country’s cause with unflagging zeal. We have, as Members of this Congress, taken upon ourselves a sacred duty—and be it ours to go on in the discharge of it with faith in our mission, hope for the future, and loyal trust in the sense of justice and righteousness of the Government of Her Majesty the Queen-Empress. (*Loud and continued cheers.*)

MR. D. E. WACHA

INTRODUCTION

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—From my heart I thank you all for the honour you have done me in calling me to preside over the deliberations of your assembly which, to-day, enters on the seventeenth year of its career of national usefulness. It is indeed most kind of the gentleman who, on your behalf, just proposed, seconded and supported my election in such complimentary terms, to observe that I have earned the honour by my steady devotion to the work of the Congress. For this mark of confidence I feel grateful to you, though you will believe me when I say that that work to me has been all through a labour of love. Let me hope that so long as health permits and this life lasts, it may be in my power to devote myself to that work with the same love, unflinchingly and unselfishly.

THE LATE MR. JUSTICE RANADE

I now crave your indulgence for a few minutes to refer to some of the mournful occurrences which have taken place since you last met at Lahore, and which have, eclipse like, cast their dismal shadow over the land. The hand of death seems to have been specially busy during the interval, reaping a harvest which has filled us with the greatest grief. No sooner had the new century dawned on the horizon than the Reaper claimed as his own one of the greatest and noblest sons of India, the like of whom she may not see for many a year to come. Suddenly and without warning, Mr. M. G. Ranade breathed his last on 17th January. The country was, at once plunged into the deepest sorrow at this national calamity. Mr. Ranade,

the erudite judge, the profound scholar, the keen student of Indian economics, the philosopher cast in the Hellenic mould, reminding us of Socratic intellect and Socratic simplicity, the pure patriot, of glowing zeal, and above all, the spotless citizen of boundless faith and hope, is no more. Whether, as the poet says, he has gone to swell the fullness of the eternal psalm, or rise slowly to a higher birth or, as George Elliot pathetically sings, to join the Choir Invisible of the Immortal Dead who live again, his voice shall always remain with us, reminding us, and the generations to come after us, of the great unselfish career in the cause of his country, stimulating us by his example to follow in his wake, and urging to leave our foot-prints however slight, on the sands of time. Like Mr. Gladstone, he showed, as Mr. Morley informed his audience at Manchester eight weeks ago, the great things which a great man may make of life. Like our veteran living patriot, who still labours for his country's good six thousand miles away, perseveringly and patiently, Mr. Ranade also made the public good the ruling motive of his life from the beginning of his public career to its end. May India cherish his memory for ever and ever!

THE LATE QUEEN VICTORIA

Ere, however, the tears on the death of Mr. Ranade were dry, the whole country, along with the rest of the British Empire, was overwhelmed with greater grief at the demise of our late gracious Queen-Empress. Universal lamentation followed the event from which we have not yet finally emerged. Such was the beneficent influence of that illustrious Sovereign during her life-time that though she never paid a visit to India, her people,—men, women and children—seemed, as if by magic, to feel her gracious presence and be gladdened by the thought that she really moved and lived among them. Such magnetic attraction, from so long a distance, was indeed marvellous, and could only be accounted for by her uniform solicitude and regard for her Indian subjects. One touch of her love for them had made the whole world of India aglow with deep reverence and respect for her. Thus it is that in the death

of Good Queen Victoria, Indians mourn not only the loss of a unique Sovereign, of great benignity and greater grace, but of an affectionate mother and the type of the highest and most exalted womanhood. Already history has enshrined her memory as the greatest of English sovereigns who, for the unprecedented period of sixty-four years, had bravely and majestically borne the yoke of a mighty empire which had grown with the growth of her rule, east and west, and counted well-nigh one-fourth of the human race. As far as her Indian subjects were concerned, every important domestic event in the Royal household, or historical occurrence in the country, had had the influence of attaching them closer and closer to her throne, and deepening their loyalty towards her person and rule. Her solicitude for their moral and material welfare, her sincere Royal wish for equal and impartial justice, and her spirit of religious toleration are now matters of history. They have proved the strongest link in the chain which binds them to the beneficent British rule. And it may be said with truth in her case that in their contentment and security and in their gratitude for her government, she had, in the words of her own memorable Proclamation, twice reaffirmed, her "best reward". The Queen-Empress is no more, but in the words of the late Poet-Laureate, it may be observed that if she has now laid aside her terrestrial crown, she now wears another and truer one than any wreath that humanity can weave for her. In every part of the country memorials are being raised which are destined, like those ancient monoliths of the great Ashoka of happy memory, to perpetuate her name so long as the sun and moon endure. But more than monuments of marble and bronze, it may be unhesitatingly observed that the name of Victoria the Good will live for ages to come in the hearts and affections of the Indian people.

THE LATE MR. MCKINLEY

The death of another exalted personage, by the hand of a dastardly assassin is also greatly to be lamented. Though not directly connected with India, the Indians have a genuine love and regard for the Americans, who

are, after all, the kith and kin of the English beyond the Atlantic. We are specially grateful to them for their generous sympathy and support during the dark days of the two severe famines which closed the nineteenth century. It was an act of international sympathy which we Indians can never forget. The death of Mr. McKinley, late President of the United States, is, therefore, greatly deplored by us. It is indeed mournful to reflect that so good, so capable, and so popular a President should have fallen by the hand of one of the bands of that fanatic brotherhood, who entertain the frenzied cult that Society and Order are best served by anarchy and shooting down or stabbing princes, potentates and presidents. That such ideas should now and again take practical shape is deplorable. They sully the fair fame of the West, which, it is to be hoped, Civilization and Humanity may soon put an end to.

THE LATE SIR SESHADRI

Lastly, we cannot but be sorry for the death, at the early age of fifty-seven, of Sir Seshadri, the distinguished Dewan of the Mysore State. In him the country loses an administrator of the highest capacity and most matured experience. He was the latest instance of the Indian statesman, who had shown himself capable of governing fully an indigenous State with as much skill and sagacity, judgment and determination, tact and sympathy as some of the greatest of English administrators who have left their mark on British Indian history. Sir Seshadri has now gone to swell that illustrious roll of modern Indian statesmen at whose head shines the ever-to-be-remembered Sir Salar Jung; but let us hope that all our Native States may from time to time produce administrators of similar ability and renown to demonstrate, if demonstration be still needed, that statesmanship is not a monopoly which is confined to one race and one country alone.

THE COMING CORONATION

But let me now turn from the mournful past to the gladsome present. The Prince of Wales whose respectful acquaintance this country made over a quarter of a century

ago is now the King of England and Emperor of India. We are greatly rejoiced at the fact that there now sits for the first time on the venerable throne of King Alfred the Great, whose millenary was so enthusiastically celebrated a few months since, a Sovereign who had visited this great Empire which is justly said to be the brightest jewel in the British Crown, and won the hearts of its princes and people by his unaffected simplicity, his incomparable grace, and his sterling sympathy. The circumstance is unique indeed in the annals of England and India alike which History will not fail to record in the fulness of time. Our only regret is that the gentle and popular Queen Alexandra did not accompany her royal Consort on that occasion. All the same the great esteem and regard in which she is held is no less than that in which Indians held her late illustrious mother. Exactly six months from this day the country will have the pleasure of laying at the foot of the throne of Their Majesties, on the auspicious occasion of their Coronation, its sincere congratulations and further expressions of its attachment and devotion to their rule. It becomes, therefore, the duty of this Congress, now assembled in session, to take the necessary steps to be able to offer at the time its dutiful address of congratulation to Their Gracious Majesties and wish them a happy and brilliant reign. And let us fervently hope that reviving the immemorial usage of former sovereigns of this ancient country, His Majesty may be pleased to take occasion by the hand and confer on the people some mark of his royal justice and beneficence, which shall not only evoke unbounded enthusiasm among them but hand down his august name with feelings of the greatest gratitude to their children's children for many a generation to come.

FAMINE SLOWLY PASSES AWAY

Turning now to a retrospect of the year just coming to a close, the first important event which attracts our attention is the passing away, slowly but steadily, of the famine conditions which unhappily prevailed to a deplorable extent during the preceding twelve months. The recent monsoon, with its fair harvest, has greatly tended

to improve those conditions though it is a fact that parts of Gujarat and the Deccan as well as Kathiawar are in the throes of a third famine. The situation there is not only gruesome but positively heart-rending. Apart from the holocaust, the two previous seasons of insufficient rainfall have claimed, both in men and plough cattle, there is apprehended this time a dearth of drinking water as the season advances. This contingency is awful to contemplate. But it is to be devoutly hoped that the winter rains may tend to alleviate the aggravated condition of hardship and distress from which the peasantry is suffering at present. We are, however, aware of the anxiety of the Government in reference to the grievous situation of the two provinces. It is indeed gratifying to record the fact that since the date of the assumption of his high office, the Viceroy has been able to infuse among the officials not a little of his own spirit of greater watchfulness, solicitude, sympathy, and, above all, of speedy action for those suffering from the visitations of famine. That spirit will, no doubt, be able, as far as human efforts can go, to alleviate in a great measure the affliction of those who are now unhappily subjected for the third time to the appalling inroads of the drought.

EFFECTS OF FAMINE

It goes without saying that the two admittedly severest famines of the century have greatly taxed the energy and resources of the Government. We have been officially informed that the total cost of relief on their account has amounted to 25 crores of rupees, whereof $17\frac{1}{4}$ crores are direct expenditure. But great as this cost is, it is nothing in comparison with the loss of crores entailed on the peasantry in the afflicted parts by reason of deficient crops and almost total destruction of agricultural cattle. It is to be greatly feared that the restoration of the live stock to the number which was estimated before the famine commenced will take some years. Meanwhile this diminution of the ryot's capital is certain to tell upon his industry and bare annual income. So that the sacrifice the State has undergone cannot be considered to be abnormally heavy relatively to the losses which the impoverished ryots

have suffered. Already the Government has told us of the returning prosperity to its finances. Unfortunately the same can in no way be predicted of the peasantry, who will be more closely chained to the wheel of toil for the next ten years at the least in order to be able to retrieve the utterly destitute position into which they have been plunged by the double calamity. It would, however, be illogical to jump to the conclusion that because State finances are supposed to prosper, therefore, the mass of the cultivators are prospering also. Nothing is more delusive or opposed to fact.

STATE AND PRIVATE RELIEF

Again, it is of importance to remember that all over the world. State expenditure has to be derived from the annual produce of the land. In India especially nearly 28 per cent. of the gross revenue is derived from the tillers of the soil, who form the bulk of the population. It is not as if the State by its own diligence were able to accumulate 25 crores of rupees, which it afterwards sacrificed for the relief of millions of distressed and starving humanity. All the money comes from the labour of the sweating cultivators themselves. Practically, therefore, in spending the monies on the famine-stricken, the Government, as an enlightened but alien and Christian Government, was doing no more than the duty it owed to those who yearly contribute crores to its treasury. But the spirit of humanity which prompts so large an expenditure, when famine unhappily overtakes the land, is beyond all praise. Organised State philanthropy is, however, known to be a plant of too recent growth. It is needless to remind you that up to the date of the Behar famine of 1866, there were no systematic relief operations of the character which we have since witnessed. This methodical system of relief has developed with the march of civilization and the progress of humane ideas all over the world. Just as in matters of jail discipline and reforms, there has been a great evolution in the mind of the British people, so in reference to famine relief. England herself, half a century ago, would have hardly thought of such a perfected

standard of relief operations as was practically carried out in India during the two recent famines. But not to go too far, take the case of Russia of to-day. It is well known that there has been a prolonged famine in that country for the last seven years consecutively. Can it, however, be said that even now she has realised the standard of relief organisation which the British Indian Government, despite many mistakes, has on the whole so successfully carried out? Thus, in judging of the relative efficiency of relief in matters of famine, it is essential for purposes of a just comparison to take into consideration the standard of charity and philanthropy which may have prevailed in a given country at a given age. It would, however, be unfair to judge of the results of one period by applying to it a standard prevalent in another.

INDIA'S GRATITUDE AND PATIENCE

None will have the temerity to deny that the Government of India, in coping with the two recent famines, has achieved a success never before attained. The key to that success may be principally discovered in that lofty standard of duty and responsibility which it prescribed to itself, no doubt, prompted by the humanitarian views which the civilisation of the nineteenth century has almost crystallised all over the world. Secondly, it may be perceived in the solicitude of the authorities to profit by their previous experience. For this act of State humanity, India acknowledges with unanimous voice its warmest gratitude. And, while it is a pleasure to record this memorable fact, it is equally a pleasure to refer to that private charity and beneficence which were visible during the dismal period. Despite bad trade and diminishing prosperity in our staple arts and manufactures, the fountain of that charity constantly flowed. State relief was most liberally supplemented by private, as the recent publication of the Report of the Central Committee of the Famine Relief Fund informs us. But what greatly adds to the merit of this private charity is the magnificent fund raised by the Lord Mayor of London, by Lancashire, by other counties in England, by Australia and by the United States.

Indians are not insensible to these foreign donations in money and grain. They feel extremely grateful to England and England's kith and kin beyond the seas for what they have done with regard to the alleviation of starving humanity in this country. Barring the "melancholy meanness" of the British Exchequer in persistently refusing to render financial justice to India by giving a grant of 5 millions sterling, it is indeed a bright episode in our mournful annals, which is certain to be remembered for many a year to come. But if the State has nobly discharged its duty, it is indeed a matter of the greatest satisfaction to notice the testimony borne by all who have visited the famine camps, from His Excellency the Viceroy down to the humblest person, to the exemplary powers of patience and endurance displayed by the unhappy famished themselves all through the most trying periods through which they endeavoured to struggle for existence. In the words of the Finance Minister as recorded in his last budget, they are certain to "leave a memorable record in the history of mankind".

THE FAMINE POLICY OF THE BOMBAY GOVERNMENT

The lessons, however, which the two famines have taught will, it is to be devoutly hoped, be carefully borne in mind. Much has no doubt been done, and done with success. But much more still remains to be done. The defects pointed out by the Commissions of 1898 and 1900 should be removed, especially those revealed in Bombay. No doubt, the Government of that Presidency has attempted an elaborate defence of the details of its famine management, which had been severely criticised by Sir Antony MacDonnell and his colleagues. But much of that laborious rejoinder is unconvincing. Anyhow, it has not improved the position of that Government if public opinion expressed on that *apology* is to be taken into consideration. But be the defence right or wrong, it cannot be gainsaid, broadly speaking, that the Bombay Government had misconceived its true functions as regards famine relief operations both in 1897 and 1899—the result, in my personal opinion, of a too illiberal and

narrow view of the situation. In that Presidency there was some strange infatuation on the part of those responsible for the relief which led to the many deplorable incidents in Gujarat. The primary idea was to run famine on the cheap. Hence there was considerable false economy of a most grievous character, which ultimately resulted in heavy mortality and most acute stage of the famine. The tests were hard and unreasonable, while the system of wages and task-work was unusually rigorous. But on this subject, and on that of the appalling inadequacy of the medical staff employed—an inadequacy of which His Excellency the Viceroy was himself personally convinced when visiting the Guzarat Relief Camp—the Commission, so ably presided over by Sir Antony MacDonnell, have commented so freely that I would fain refrain from repeating them here. Apart from the mortality caused by the most illiberal policy pursued for a time by the Bombay Government, but eventually modified under severe pressure of public opinion, there was a large number of deaths from cholera, owing to the inadequacy of medical hospital assistants.

“Cholera raged in May,” say the Commissioners, “and did not finally abate till August. It is stated by all witnesses that much of the mortality due to cholera was wrongly assigned to other diseases, and it is evident from the figures given below that to a large extent this was so.”

But even apart from cholera, the excessive mortality from famine in Bombay Presidency was deplorable.

“Making allowances,” again say the Commissioners, “it is not possible to dissociate the mortality from the famine or to regard it as inevitable. We have no doubt that the mortality in the period up to May would have been less, had more works been opened near the peoples’ homes in the Kaira and the Panch Mahal districts, and had the provisions of the Famine Code in regard to the distribution of gratuitous relief in the villages been acted upon with due liberality. We are also of opinion that much of the cholera mortality would have been avoided had the provision in reserve of a scheme of village works enabled the authorities to split up the large works and return people to their homes, and had the organization on the works been more efficient.”

Thus, it will be seen how the famine policy of the Bombay Government was comparatively a failure. That

authority, which was taken to task from the very beginning by its critics, was too self-sufficient to modify its mistaken policy, which eventually resulted in such heavy and lamentable mortality. Nay more. An attempt was seriously made in the Press to contradict public opinion as if it were valueless or unfounded. The results of the Commission's investigation have now demonstrated the fact that, after all, the public were in the right, and those responsible for the famine operations grievously in the wrong. That error has now been admitted by the Bombay Government, but it is indeed most extraordinary that it should have pleaded it as a justification of the policy it pursued. In its defence it has laid the blame of that error at the door of the Government of India. It puts forth in its extenuation the circular of Mr. Holderness which prescribed economy. It did nothing but faithfully follow it, practising economy with a vengeance. This part of the defence has already been severely criticised. Commenting on it, the *Advocate of India*, in its issue of the 22nd November 1901, justly observed :

It is inconceivable to our mind that the Executive should have been so overpowered by this perfectly legitimate act of the Government of India that it felt bound to shirk its obvious and plain duty at a time of emergency and to hold tight on the public purse-strings whilst the people were dying in thousands from sheer want.

In plain words, the defence of the Bombay Government amounts to this—that it refused to do its obvious duty because it had been warned by the Circular to be careful how the money given to it was spent :

"If doubt actually existed as to the meaning of the Circular," proceeds the *Advocate*, "this could have been brushed away in half an hour by the simple process of wiring to Simla for specific instructions. To openly declare at this date that they feared to incur censure is an admission of neglect of a precaution which would have entirely obviated any such criticism of the Bombay famine policy."

A HOLLOW DEFENCE

Again, the *Times of India*, which also throughout fairly criticised that policy on the basis of the authentic information carefully supplied by its own representative

and other correspondents, is constrained to observe in reference to their extraordinary self-incriminating defence that :

It is more in the nature of a statement of the difficulties which the Bombay Government had to encounter in meeting the last famine, than a vindication of what they actually did. . . . It is not easy to distinguish between the excuses of the Bombay Government and the accusations brought against them by critics of their famine policy. . . . They admit that their arrangements were not sufficient to meet adequately the emergency which arose.

And what was the reason? The Government of Bombay pleads the following :—

The recurrence within two years of a more extensive famine than those of 1876-77, and 1896-97 was not considered to be a danger to be seriously anticipated.

How fatuous is this reasoning and how strange indeed that a responsible Government should give it currency, when common sense informed the Presidency at large that one famine following closely at the heel of another, without having afforded any breathing time to the ryot to recuperate himself to however small an extent, cannot but hit him harder, and suggested that, therefore, the State should be fully prepared for the more distressing emergency certain to arise. On this defence of the Government of Bombay, just quoted, the *Times of India* (22nd November) had the following further scathing commentary :—

We have only to substitute war for famine, and the Commander-in-Chief for the Government of Bombay, to illustrate the utter untenableness of this explanation. . . . The collapse of Gujarat was to some extent unexpected, but how do Government reconcile the confession in the fifth paragraph of their letter, that they under-estimated the resources and staying power of the inhabitants of that province with the statement in the third section of the next paragraph that the relations of the Collector with the subordinate officers are so close that nothing abnormal should long escape his notice, and there is no chance of any distress occurring without his having had an opportunity for preparing for it.

The abnormal did happen. It was pointed out at the earliest stage by all outside critics, even the most

friendly, that the second famine was of abnormal intensity, and yet the Government of Bombay obstinately adhered to that attitude of non-chalance, as if the thousands of deaths by starvation, which undoubtedly resulted from that attitude, were nothing to it! Every just critic of that Government will, therefore, agree with the perfectly fair observation of the *Times of India* that:

The mistakes of the famine administration are all traceable to the absence at headquarters of sufficient appreciation and knowledge of the conditions and economy of district administration.

GUJARAT INQUIRY AND GENERAL WHITEWASHING

Neither has the Bombay Government presented an edifying figure by its extraordinary action in the matter of the Gujarat Inquiry. Its Resolution thereon is even more indefensible than the excuse of its famine policy. After having instituted a judicial inquiry and received the verdict of the trying authority, it seems to have gone behind the judgment of Mr. Maconochie, and by a procedure which has been universally pronounced to be utterly illogical, if not something worse, tried to whitewash itself and the subordinates implicated from the allegations made in the Legislative Council by the Hon'ble Mr. Gokuldas K. Parekh, namely, tyrannising the destitute ryot and exacting revenue with the left hand, while doling out *takavi* advances with the right. Public condemnation of this way of disposing of the scandal is great, and I need not say that it has in no way enhanced the reputation of that Government. If at all, it has by its impatience of enlightened and even authoritative criticism done its best to diminish the confidence of the people in the impartiality of its administration. Only two individuals stand not in shining relief in this matter—Mr. Maconochie and the Hon. Mr. Gokuldas Kahandas Parekh. The verdict of the former is accepted as being independent and impartial, while the great courage displayed by Mr. Gokuldas in proving his allegations to the hilt at immense sacrifice is universally praised. He has, in fact, fully vindicated himself and "Gujarati," his original informant.

IS THERE RESPONSIBILITY IN THE GOVERNMENT ?

Gentlemen, I think I have now referred at sufficient length to the extraordinary and most unconvincing defence the Bombay Government has made with regard to its famine policy, and would, therefore, refrain from further animadverting on it. We may leave that Government to derive such consolation from it as best it may. The more serious constitutional question, however, which arises from it should not be allowed to escape our attention. What we have to ask is, whether there is any responsibility with any authority whatever in this serious matter? Or is it still the case, as was stated years ago, by John Bright in one of his memorable speeches, that in India it would seem that there are three kinds of responsibility, namely, "the question of divided responsibility, of concealed responsibility, and of no responsibility whatever". It should be borne in mind that there is great danger in a repetition of such error of judgment in future in any Provincial Government. It is, therefore, to be devoutly hoped that the beneficent intentions and instructions of the Government of India with regard to famine will everywhere be followed with scrupulous care and faithfulness in future operations, which we all hope may now be remote.

FAMINE CODES DO NOT PREVENT FAMINE

This subject naturally leads us to the Famine Code itself. In all human affairs it has long been recognised that, however perfect the measures may be, the value of their perfection greatly depends on the men who eventually happen to carry them out. In matters of State, the same proposition holds equally good. Hence, the Government of India may go on tinkering and perfecting its Code, ever so long, but it is hopeless to expect that while the men, to carry out its excellent provisions in practice, are not of the right type, all the good that might be expected will be achieved. And, after all, what may the most perfect Famine Codes accomplish? They will *not prevent* famine. At the best they are a set of instructions to guide and direct the famine officials how to act under

given circumstances and how famine may be allayed. Though, therefore, the efforts which the Government of India makes, on the recommendations of each Famine Commission, to improve the Famine Code, are praiseworthy, it must be candidly observed that they are in a way futile. Not all the codes and pandects on famine relief will ever go to *prevent* famine by a hair's breadth. Statesmanship lies not in devising these Codes but in concerting far-sighted measures which shall *prevent* famine. Famine Codes are most useful when famine actually prevails; but by themselves they do not avoid famine.

IMPOLICY OF RUNNING FAMINE ON THE CHEAP

Another point in the same connection may here be touched before I proceed to make a few observations on the prevention of famine. The Famine Commission compute the total direct expenditure on the last famine at ten crores of rupees, and the indirect at five crores more. But this aggregate expenditure of fifteen crores is characterised as excessive. They say "it far exceeds that incurred in any previous famine". Evidently, it is implied that the State in future should take care that such a large expenditure is not incurred. They, however, felt conscious while making the remark that it was liable to be misunderstood. So immediately follows the qualification, namely, that they

do not for a moment advocate a departure from the humane policy of famine relief laid down by the Government of India; but experience has shown that the object in view can be attained at a moderate cost with little demoralization, if prudence and foresight be duly exercised, and if means be properly adjusted to ends.

As laid down in the abstract the principle is indeed admirable. But who is to be the judge of moderation? It will all depend on the view the chief officials at the seat of the Central Government may take at a period of famine. The Imperial treasury may be far from full; or it may be that it has to disburse large sums on other undertakings or on warlike operations. Under such a condition of affairs the Imperial fiat might go forth that famine expenditure should be kept well in hand—in other words, most

niggardly incurred. The practical result of such an order may be easily anticipated. The provincial administrations would readily fall in with the views of the Central Government and endeavour to do all in their power to run famine on the cheap, as the Bombay Government actually did. The last found a convenient excuse for its own condition of unpreparedness by laying the blame at the door of the Government of India. This is the great evil to be avoided. In the case of Mr. Holderness' Circular alluded to, it is superfluous to observe that it was the subject of much hostile criticism throughout the country. In substance, it enjoined expenditure to be kept as low as possible, no doubt consistent with safety to the life of the famished (which was *the* point the supine Government of Bombay grievously missed) under the pretext of preventing people not in need of State aid flocking to the famine camps. That plea had really no solid foundation in fact, and remains unsupported even after the report of Sir Antony MacDonnell's Commission. As a matter of fact, if people began to crowd at the very outbreak of the famine in relief camps, it was because they found themselves utterly prostrate and destitute after the effects of the earlier visitation of 1896-97. They had absolutely no breathing time to recuperate themselves. Evidence of the crippled and helpless condition to which most of the peasantry in the afflicted parts were reduced by the famine of that year is not wanting in Sir James Lyall's report. It is, therefore, quite intelligible there is greater influx of the starving at the very outbreak of the second visitation. But such a phenomenon should have been carefully investigated and the causes verified before taking unnecessary alarm and issuing that ill-fated Circular, which, in Bombay at least, worked so disastrously.

PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE

Having observed so much, it should not be understood that the abstract principle laid down by the Government of India is unsound, namely, that famine expenditure everywhere should be judiciously regulated with a due regard to the conditions of each locality. On the contrary,

it is but right and proper that the State should safeguard the interest of the general tax-payer. But will all know how in Indian affairs principles laid down in the abstract are one thing, while their practical carrying out is another? In famine matters it is the case that some of the Provincial Governments, with their finances at a low ebb, are naturally prone to economise expenditure to a dangerously narrow limit. They always try to be one better in the exercise of their economic conscience than the Central authority itself. This tendency on the part of subordinate Administrations needs to be carefully watched and checked, as if unwatched and uncontrolled from above, it is prolific of the greatest mischief to the starving population. Again, in carrying out the instructions of the Central authority for a judicious expenditure, it is highly essential that the human factor should on no account be overlooked. In famine relief operations finance has to be subordinate to humanity itself. Discrimination and human sympathy for the woes and sufferings of the starving and the dying, of orphans and widows, of the sick and the infirm, of the less able-bodied and the helpless women—these demand paramount consideration. It is to be feared that it is a disregard of this special aspect of famine which eventually leads to illiberal expenditure every way and exposes all Administration to the adverse but justifiable criticism of the public. So much for the evil of circulars of the character just alluded to.

THE EXAMPLE OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

But Provincial Administrations are also apt sometimes to be carried away, when, in obedience to so-called "confidential" circulars, issued by the Central authority, called upon to practise economy of a penny-wise but mischievous character. This specially happens when the Imperial Government finds itself financially embarrassed by one reason or another. I need not recall here the two historical instances which occurred during 1877-78, with reference to the famine in the Madras Presidency and in the North-West Provinces. The Indian Government was then in a state of hostility with the Amir of Afghanistan.

The Imperial Treasury wanted all the money for the last object, but you cannot have forgotten what the sequel was. I pass over in silence the narrative of that most lamentable famine, which resulted in the terrible mortality of $12\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs in the N.-W. Provinces, and of 20 lakhs in Madras, as related in the Famine Commission Report of 1880.

RATIONAL WAY OF EXPENDING MONIES ON FAMINE RELIEF

It would be thus seen how dangerous is it to lay down a hard-and-fast line with regard to famine expenditure. Moreover, just ponder for a moment on the monies, which the State spends like water on a border or trans-frontier war, the *raison d'être* even of which may be more than doubtful. Crores are spent on warlike operations, the ethics of which may be most questionable, on the plea of repelling external enemies; but when at our own door our own enemy claims victims by thousands and millions, the economic conscience of the Government seems to undergo a sudden evolution, the purse is at once tightened, and all economic lessons are at once remembered! In fact, the policy would seem to be that you may spend as many crores as you like on frontier scares and wild goose expeditions, but when it comes to laying low the internal enemy of famine at your very door, the man in charge of the Imperial Treasury must sit tight and discourage all judicious expenditure! Let us hope such a policy will no longer find ascendancy in the Council of the Government of India. Expenditure on famine must be regulated in each instance according to its extent, its intensity, and the local circumstances accompanying it. It is the only rational method to pursue if the ultimate object is to see that not a single soul, as the Viceroy, be it said to the credit of his humanity, justly said, dies of starvation. And here it may be worth remembering that the monies spent, whether they be 10 crores or 15 crores, are, after all, the monies contributed by the very people for whose relief that expenditure is incurred. Cheese-paring expenditure and low mortality are never compatible. It is only by a discriminate and liberal

expenditure that the starving millions can be saved from the jaws of death. We are, however, told that the Government is bound to watch the interests of the general taxpayer. But may it be asked who is that entity? Is he not the same individual whose class annually contributes well-nigh 50 crores to the Imperial Treasury under the following heads?

			Crores Rs.
Land Revenue	...	...	26
Salt			
Stamps			
Excise			
Provincial Rates			
Registration			

And is it not the case that it is the same mass of people who contribute those 50 crores who flock to the relief camps in times of famine when driven by sheer desperation and want? One-fifth of this annual contribution only comes to 10 crores. But, as is officially declared, famine recurs in the land once every 11 years, though, of course, the late famine was an exception. So that 2 per cent. of his own contribution once in 11 years is certainly not an extravagant expenditure to alleviate his distress in times of scarcity or famine. In other words, if you reserve one-fifth per cent. of 50 crores per annum, is it a great or extraordinary sum? Let me inform you, Gentlemen, that in the matter of Railway Finance alone, the State incurs a net loss to the extent of a crore of rupees per annum, which is met from the ordinary revenues of the Empire. This fact may be ascertained by anyone desirous to verify it from the Administration Reports of Railways. It was brought out, again, in evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and I would draw the attention of you all to Appendix No. 28, at page 225, Vol. II of the Report. But this crore is *unseen*, and, therefore, attracts attention.

SIR CHARLES ON FAMINE EXPENDITURE

It is, therefore, to be sincerely hoped that famine expenditure will be incurred in conformity with the peculiar conditions attendant on each famine rather than on any

hard and fast lines which the Imperial Government may choose to dictate to suit its own peculiar exigencies of the hour. In this connection I am disposed to agree with the remarks made by Sir Charles Elliott in his second contribution to the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for October last, which critically examines the report of the Famine Commission. It is to be presumed most of you, if not all, have learned what views Sir Charles holds on the alleged excessive cost of the last famine. That distinguished official is a recognised authority on the question of famine. His experience of famine expenditure may be said to be even greater than any member of the Famine Commission. Sir Charles is not at all convinced from the evidence collected by the Commission that the cost was at all excessive, bearing in mind, firstly, the intensity of the famine, following as it did the one of 1896-97, and, secondly, the extent of the relief that was administered and the duration of it. Having said so much on this financial aspect of the Famine Commission's report, we may congratulate Sir Antony MacDonnell and his colleagues on other matters on which they have expressed their candid opinion. No doubt, almost all of us will differ as regards their pronouncement on the incidence of land-revenue assessment and the burning question of restriction of transfer. But it is satisfactory to note that in the main the Commission has endorsed almost all the objections urged by leading exponents of Indian thought in the country, and specially those raised in my own Presidency as regards suspensions and remissions of revenue and the concentration, as far as possible, of famine labour on village relief works and other cognate matters. It is also satisfactory to note the genuine testimony borne by the Commission, as all other experts in agricultural matters have done, to the skill of the Indian peasant. Here is a pregnant sentence which may be well borne in mind :

In the mere practice of cultivation, Agricultural Departments have probably much to learn from the cultivator.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

As regards the many practical recommendations made by the Commission, it is not possible to refer to them in

this place at any great length. This, however, may be observed: that if they are carried out in the spirit in which they are made, a wholesome change in the conditions of the impoverished peasantry may be slowly discernible. As matters stand at present, it is to be feared that it will be long before all traces of the evil effects of the last two famines disappear from the land. But meanwhile all the State can do, in pursuance of the recommendations now made, will no doubt to a certain extent tend to ameliorate his condition. At present he is so far crippled as to be scarcely able to stand on his legs. As the Commission says, the State will have to "put heart" in him with a view to rehabilitate him. Anything which contributes to bring back his former staying powers, the absence of which drove him, at the very threshold of the last famine, to the relief camp, will be considered as the first hopeful sign of returning prosperity.

THE CONVERTS FAMINE HAS MADE

This brings me, Gentlemen, to the subject of the *prevention* of famine. Till within the last twelve or fifteen months the entire official classes in the country and their supporters in the Press, as well as not a few outsiders, Europeans, of course, were so deeply ingrained in their belief as to the absolute impossibility of controlling famine that it had become well-nigh a hopeless task to reason with them and bring conviction home to their minds that however unkind Nature may be, and however deficient harvests may be owing to the inadequacy of the rainfall, famine itself, that is, the condition of destitution and suffering to which masses of people are reduced by drought, was preventible.

But the phenomena presented in all the afflicted localities during the last calamitous visitation, it is satisfactory to note, have spontaneously brought home that truth which arguments had vainly sought to teach. The conditions prevalent during 1899-1900 have themselves been the greatest teachers, and those who were so stubborn of conviction have been the first to acknowledge themselves

as converts. It was observed that there was sufficient store of food in the country, the surplus of the grain produced by the more favoured provinces, to feed the hungry and the starving. But though the food-grains were there, there were no means for the famished to buy them. It was the revelation of this fact which wrought the conversion. And among those who were perforce obliged to admit the inexorable logic of that fact was the Secretary of State himself. After having persistently denied, no doubt from want of accurate knowledge of the real economic situation prevalent in the country for years past, that famine was preventible, his Lordship had to admit what the school of the pessimists had been endeavouring since 1896 to instil into his mind, that it was. That recognition was indeed no mean conquest of truth over the forces of ignorance, which had contributed so largely to a complacent belief in the optimism which declared that all was going well and nothing could improve so happy a condition of affairs. In reality, there was a confusion of ideas in the minds of the optimists. Drought itself was identified with famine. Sir William Wedderburn and others, with a clear insight into the questions derived from their superior knowledge and experience, pointed out time out of mind that drought, aye of the severest character, may befall a country, and yet there may be no famine, in other words, no sufferings to which the poor tillers of the soil, numbered by millions, are subjected by reason of the effects of the drought. In short, none has rendered greater service in dispelling that confusion than Sir William. And next to him, we may offer our warm and grateful thanks to Mr. Leonard Courtney, a statesman and an economist, whose views are listened to with the greatest respect and attention by both the great parties in Parliament. At the preliminary Conference of the Indian Famine Union held on June 7th, at Westminster Palace Hotel, he took special care to make it clear in his presidential address at the very outset what famine was. I think the observations he then made deserve to be repeated on this occasion, if only to emphasise their significance once more, and doubly convince that school which till late thought that famine was an act of

Providence, and, therefore, as impossible of check and control as the planetary system.

He saw an objective that would at once be raised by some, arising out of the improper meaning which were attributed by many men to the word famine. They would say that it was sought to abolish the alternation of the seasons, that there would be periods more or less of drought, that all the wise men in the world would not be able to prevent that in the future. and that they must, therefore, expect famine as a necessary thing in the future history of the world. But that phase did not cover the proper use of the word famine. He would not say that it was beyond the reach of human thought to abolish droughts; it might be that by the partial reafforestation of India the risk of drought might be diminished; it might be that by the continual conquest of Nature, we might be able to do away with the effects of that scarcity of rain which happened in a particular season. But famine was not drought, or even the lack of produce which followed from drought; it was the sufferings of human creatures which was consequent upon these varying seasons, the deprivation of the means of sustenance that such seasons of calamity brought.

CAUSES WHICH HAVE LED TO FAMINE

Having thus cleared the ground as to what constitutes famine, the next question which we have to consider is the causes which led to it. For, it is only when the physician has diagnosed the disease that he is able to prescribe a cure. To probe, therefore, to the bottom of the cause or causes of the severe famines which have recently visited this country and which threaten to be more frequent than before, is the paramount duty of the citizen and the State alike. Practical remedies which in a measure may tend to minimise the sufferings of famine in the future are only possible and feasible when the true causes have been accurately ascertained beyond all contradiction. And here it may be not unuseful to remind you that famine is not a calamity known to India alone. Famines have prevailed all over the world from time to time. But we have heard very little of them during the last fifty or seventy years, save now and again in Russia, and sometimes in Ireland and Italy. Leaving aside all other countries, let us take the case of England alone. How is it that there at least for half-a-century past there is no such calamity as famine, though the country depends for two-thirds of its food-

supply on foreign nations? Is it not the case that it is the vast and most satisfactory improvement in the economic condition of the English labourer and artisan which has banished the sufferings? There might have been any quantity of food-supply from foreign parts; but so long as there was the lack of the necessary means to buy that supply, the food for all intents and purposes might as well be at the bottom of the sea. Now the one phenomenon, above all others, which was discerned on the surface in India in reference to the last famine, was the almost total disability of the masses to maintain themselves and their families no sooner than the conditions of a deficient harvest were established. This phenomenon was not a new one. But what happened in previous famines was that the famished did not resort to the relief camps in large numbers at the very outset. They did possess *some* staying power, some means which enabled them to subsist for a time without State relief. It was only when the pinchings of poverty became acute and began to be seriously felt, with the approach of the summer season, that they were to be noticed seeking relief. Why, then, this difference during the last famine specially? The universal belief is that the staying power of the masses has vanished. That belief would naturally lead us to conclude that their economic conditions must have deteriorated. Here it seems there is a difference of opinion. There is the majority, more or less in full touch with the masses and their condition, which ascribes it to the growing impoverishment of the ryots, while there is the minority, chiefly the official classes, who attribute it to their imprudence and improvidence. In spite of this difference it appears that there is one agreement underlying the contentions of both. It is not denied that the ailment of the peasantry is an *economic* one. Economic causes, whether superficial, as one set of thinkers aver, or deep-rooted, as another set assert, are undoubtedly at work which have prevented the cultivator from saving enough in fat years to provide against the lean one. Of late those lean years have been many. The peasantry, in one locality or another, has not thriven since 1891. Bad harvests or woefully deficient harvests have

been frequent, which have plunged them into a heavier load of debt, from which they have barely found time to relieve themselves and be on their legs again. This much is generally acknowledged. But most of us, from our closer contact with the masses—a contact which it is scarcely possible even the best of officials can ever claim—are further of opinion that in addition to the misery and destitution arising from deficient harvests, there is the burden of the State-demand for enhanced land revenue assessments which is gnawing into the vitals of the peasantry. This demand is rigid and is collected with all the hardness of the cast-iron system, which British administration has introduced into the country. It is to be feared that periodical revisions of the Survey Department have not a little to answer for agricultural indebtedness. Instituted with the best of motives, it is now admitted by those who have carefully studied its history, say, from Lord Salisbury downwards, that revisions have been far from beneficial to the ryot. That great authority has observed in his memorable minute of 1879 that :

we may fairly discourage scientific refinements in the works of assessment which are a natural exercise of the intellect in highly cultivated officers but which worry the ryot, distribute the burdens of State with needless inequality and impose a costly machinery on the State.

Thus the periodic enhancements have been oppressive and beyond the means of the payers who, over a greater part of the country, own on an average seven acres of land. To satisfy the burdensome call at inconvenient sessions the ryot is driven into the arms of the money-lender. Once in the clutches of that entity it is almost hopeless for him to extricate himself. But this cause is denied by the officials. It is declared that the assessments are light, and that the ryot, if he suffers at all, suffers from other causes. Here, then, is a difference of opinion. Now and again departmental or other committees have sat to trace the causes. These have demonstrated that the agricultural indebtedness of the peasant is chiefly to be attributed to rack-rents. More, there have been a few

careful observers who, having fully studied this agricultural problem, have independently come to the same conclusion that we have been entertaining these many years. I have to refer you, Gentlemen, to the minutes of Sir Louis Mallet and Lord Salisbury on the subject, made as far back as 1879, and which are officially embodied in the appendices to the Famine Commission Report of the year. I would be taxing your patience and time too much if I here cited even a hundredth part of what they said. Suffice it to say that Sir Louis Mallet was strongly opposed to Survey Settlements and the enhancement of land-revenue, which was their logical resultant. He had no hesitation in observing that "the policy of further taxing the land might easily become a political danger". From the economical point of view, he regarded such a policy as "mischievous" and directly tending "to a progressive pauperisation of the community". This was said twenty years ago but who will deny the prophetic character of Sir Louis Mallet's observation, with the knowledge and light of the two famines? Progressive pauperisation is a fact which cannot be ignored. But it was not Sir Louis Mallet alone who had scented the economic mischief from afar and sounded the tocsin of "political danger". As early as 1883, a thoroughly able writer, fully conversant with the economic situation of the peasantry of the country, gave an equally serious warning in more unmistakable terms in the columns of the *Spectator*. It was observed that:

The ultimate difficulty of India, the economic situation of the cultivator, is coming to the front in a most disheartening way and is exciting among the most experienced officials a sensation of positive alarm.

That was "the great Indian danger" of the future. He accurately described the situation as follows:—

Tens of millions of persons there either can do or will do nothing but cultivate; and if cultivation does not pay, what hope have they? The traders do not buy more food of them for being rich, and they have only food to sell. They can get their clothes cheaper through free-trades and railways, but they have reduced clothes to such an appreciable minimum that the saving is not a rupee a year per house. They need nothing save only land, and land, under the

pressure of numbers becomes so dead, that either the profit per acre will not keep them, or they get too few acres for a maintenance. Other occupations would save them, but they must be occupations for millions, and where are they?

I ask you all the same question which the writer put eighteen years ago: "Where are they?" We should be all glad if there be a single official in the country who could unhesitatingly and courageously declare to-day that the description of the masses just related has been in any way exaggerated. Was he at all drawing a pessimistic picture when the same experienced writer further described the economic condition of the cultivators?

Five people cannot live and pay a direct tax in money and the interest of old debts at 16 per cent. upon five acres of over-cropped soil, without danger in bad years of a catastrophe. That is the position of the whole districts in India. All, however, that we want is a thorough examination of the subject by men who can lead opinion.

LORD SALISBURY ON LAND ASSESSMENTS

Let me now refer to one more authority, the present Prime Minister. As Secretary of State for India, it fell to the lot of Lord Salisbury to review the whole of land-revenue policy of the Government of India in the seventies. Referring to the minutes of many of his colleagues on that policy, as questioned by Sir Louis Mallet, his Lordship observed that, "they mostly shrink from the general discussion" to which he has invited them. On his part, however, he gave his opinion in a most decisive way:

So far as it is possible to change the Indian fiscal system, it is desirable the cultivator should pay a smaller proportion of the whole national charge. It is not in itself a thrifty policy to draw the mass of revenue from the rural districts, where capital is scarce, sparing the towns where it is often redundant and runs to waste in luxury. The injury is exaggerated in the case of India, where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent. As India must be bled, the lancet should be directed to the parts where the blood is congested, or at least sufficient, not to those which are already feeble from the want of it.

HOW ENHANCEMENTS HAVE GONE ON MERRILY

Gentlemen, it will be thus obvious to you that even, as far back as 1879, the condition of the peasantry was such that so well-informed a Secretary of State as Lord Salisbury, who was capable of forming an independent

judgment on the merits of the land revenue policy of the Government of India, recognised the necessity of moderating the assessments. But what has been the actual fact? You have only to discover what has been the revenue derived from land in every province save Bengal, to learn for yourselves how much of the increase is owing to normal causes, to improved communications and to the law of unearned increment, and how much to pure enhancement unaccompanied by any reasons whatever. An exhaustive inquiry into this matter will, no doubt, bring facts to the surface to confirm the view universally held. Lord Salisbury would have a difficulty in pointing to the congested parts where he could apply the lancet with safety, for the body has grown feebler and feebler and is now in an utterly prostrate condition.

AN EXHAUSTIVE INQUIRY INEVITABLE

If such, then, be the condition of the peasantry, is it not time then an exhaustive inquiry of an open and independent character long since demanded should be instituted, so as to collect all evidence which may decisively determine the principal causes of the present agrarian situation? For, it is superfluous to add that any palliative measures to superficially remedy the actual disease can never lead to the improvement which we are all anxious to seek. The misfortune is that, in the first instance, the Government of India has shrunk from doing so. It has long since dreaded to drag into daylight this great skeleton in its cupboard. But the irresistible march of circumstances is certain to leave it no alternative but expose it. A public inquiry, therefore, is inevitable. Government cannot any longer play the policy of the ostrich. It is more statesmanlike to face the ugly question and find out the truth. It is the safest as well as the speediest course. For the longer it is delayed, the worse will be the agrarian situation. And not all its legislative measures will be able to avert what Bacon calls the "rebellion of the belly", when it sets in right earnest. As the *Manchester Guardian* (November 2) has tersely put it :

We are forced to ask ourselves whether these economic evils may not be traced directly or indirectly to that famous system of

Government which has been slowly built up by the labours of many great Englishmen, and whether, while anxious to do our best for India to give her a thoroughly just and good administration, we are not unconsciously undermining the foundation of Indian society, which rests upon the peasant cultivator in his village community. . . . The whole system of land tenure and of taxation is called in question by the repeated famines, each worse than the one before it, which we have witnessed of late years.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE INDIAN FAMINE UNION

It is, therefore, to be devoutly hoped that the inquiry which the Indian Famine Union has prayed for in its most influentially signed memorial will be speedily granted. It is similar in principle to the inquiry which the Congress itself has asked for. The time for criticism has passed by, and that for constructive statesmanship has arrived. But the construction can only proceed upon a solid foundation, of ascertained facts. The materials for the foundation, therefore, are the first essential. The inquiry should consist of an examination into the economic condition of a limited number of selected villages by means of Provincial Commissions of officials and non-officials in whom the public have confidence specially chosen for each Province. I am inclined to the view that a single roving Commission going all over the country is most unlikely to achieve that object. Each Indian province differs from another. Each has its own idiosyncrasies and conditions. It is therefore essential that a Commission of experienced persons of local knowledge should inquire into the agricultural condition of each of the typical villages in their own respective provinces. Perhaps the expenditure of such Provincial Commissions may be somewhat large, but in my opinion it will be more than repaid by the valuable recommendations they may make. It would be grievous in this matter to have a dead uniformity all over the country when each province differs so much in economic conditions with another. What may suit the villages in the district of the Punjab can hardly be said to suit those residing in the districts of Southern India. When the exact economic position of the different provinces with their history and the causes of their difficulties is ascertained, we shall be on solid ground. In my opinion, the best way to proceed would be to ascertain from the

books of *sowcars*, traders and others, the prices of wages, corn, and so forth, and the cost of cultivation and maintenance at one period and compare it with similar statistics of the latest year before the outbreak of famine. It may be also important to learn which may be the villages which can boast of tiled-roof houses instead of the humble thatched ones; what may be the general quality of the food; what may be the domestic furniture, whether metallic things have replaced the primitive earthen ones and so on. Lastly, the percentage of households which may have shown these increased marks of prosperity. It is only by such a comparative compilation of statistics that the increasing prosperity or growing impoverishment of each of the typical villages can be found on which to build a fairly stable inference and proceed thereafter to prescribe the necessary remedies. Meanwhile, it is advisable to suspend all further land legislation of the mischievous character of the Bombay Land Revenue Code. It cannot be said that the agrarian legislation of the last twenty years for the amelioration of the peasantry has tendered any good. Look at the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act alone, which Sir Antony MacDonnell's Commission has pronounced to be a failure; for it has come to the conclusion that indebtedness has increased, rather than diminished in the four districts which have been under the operation of the measure for the last twenty years.

MISCHIEF OF BOMBAY AGRARIAN LEGISLATION

Nothing at this juncture in the administration of India is more to be deplored than legislative measures for the so-called improvement of the peasantry. History teaches a painful lesson in this respect which, it is to be hoped, the Government of India will bear in mind. Agrarian reforms, to cure a desperate agrarian situation, whenever undertaken in opposition to the views and the interests of the peasants, have ended in great political disasters. We need not refer to what distinguished Roman writers have said of the agricultural conditions of their own times. Again coming to modern times, we need not refer to the condition of affairs in France, in Turkey

and in the United States. In my opinion the less there is of agrarian legislation in which is to be discerned more of the arbitrariness and cupidity of rulers than their moderation and justice, the better for the peasantry and the country. Justice must be respected. Let him who sows reap, and let him who plants the tree eat its fruits. Such injustice in agrarian legislation, where the cultivator is sought to be deprived of a larger and larger portion of the fruit of his labour, must eventually culminate in slavery. The ultimate result of this policy is, that the labour of the peasant is blighted and becomes barren leading to those economic evils from which he now suffers. It is to be feared that so far as the new Land Revenue Legislation of the Bombay Presidency is concerned, these evils are likely to show themselves in all their ugliness as its operations extend. None doubts the beneficent intentions of the Government. But, after all, such intentions are judged by results. That there will be no such result, as the Government affects to believe will follow the measure, seems to be the firm conviction of the people at large, even after the debate that has taken place in the Council. It is greatly to be regretted in this matter that no attention has been paid to the popular voice. The Viceroy himself declared at Bombay, in that memorable speech he delivered at the Town Hall in reply to the address of the Bombay Municipal Corporation, that he was most anxious to listen to that opinion. And yet he refused to consider the appeal of the public to suspend the sanctioning of the Bill and allow them reasonable time to examine and consider the provisions of the amendment which is undoubtedly of a revolutionary character and which seeks to establish State landlordism in the country, which one of his predecessors, twenty years ago, repudiated on behalf of his Government. I have no inclination to enter into any disquisition on the subject of land tenures in the country. This is not the time nor the place for it. I only beg to draw your attention to one fact, and it is this: that, as Sir Louis Mallet observed, there is absolutely no fixity in the land-revenue policy of the Government. Everything varies with the views of successive Governments. Hence have arisen a

mass of inconsistencies in its land-revenue system. Lord Salisbury cynically observed :

Have we any grounds for thinking they will cease ? They are not merely subjects of reproach ; they are a warning of the fashion after which our Indian Government is made. By the law of its existence it must be a Government of incessant change. It is the despotism of a line of kings, whose reigns are limited by climatic causes to five years.

But the despots return to their homes, while the effects of their despotic action remain to harass and annoy a much enduring and patient people. Consider, Gentlemen, the action of the Government of Lord Curzon, in the matter of this Land Revenue Amendment Act, whereby the perpetuity of tenure in survey lands has been "by a stroke of the pen" abolished. It is the first forcible attempt at the assertion of State landlordism, which the Government of Lord Lytton indignantly repudiated :

We do not accept the accuracy of the description that the tenure of land in India was that of cultivating tenants, with no power to mortgage the land of the State, and that land is the property of the Government, held by the occupier as tenant on hereditary succession so long as he pays the Government demand. On the contrary, the sale and mortgage of land were recognised under the Native Government before the establishment of British power, and are not uncommon in Native States at the present time. It has been one of the great objects of all the successive Governments of India since the days of Lord Cornwallis, if not to create property in land, at all events to secure and fortify and develop it to the utmost. The Government, undoubtedly, is the owner of a first charge, the amount of which is fixed by itself on the produce of all revenue-paying land in India, but over the greater part of the Indian Empire, it is no more the owner of the cultivated land than the owner of a rent charge in England is the owner of the land upon which it is charged.—Despatch, 8th June 1880, para 31.

FAILURE OF ALL LEGISLATION

It was thus against the revolutionary character of the legislation that the Bombay public prayed for delay, but which was refused, while those non-official members who took a leading part were characterised by the Honourable Member in charge of the Bill as incapable of comprehending the very elements of reasoning, and by another as guilty

of reckless and perverse misrepresentation. Such language would not, on behalf of Ministers, have been allowed to go unchallenged in the House of Commons. But in India it seems that the amenities of our expanded Councils, where representatives of the people are invited to advise and aid Government in law-making, demand that those in power and authority should flout the representatives of the people and charge them with dishonesty when they attempt to express their honest opinion. That the representatives were offended is shown by the way in which the foremost of them, in giving his reply, expressed himself on the unpleasant incident. The Honourable Mr. Mehta observed, addressing the President :

My Lord, I acknowledge, as I said in answer to the remark of Mr. Monteth, that it is open for the people who take another view of a question to be intolerant enough to doubt the capacity, ability or intelligence of those opponents; but it is going altogether beyond the bounds of decorum and propriety, to say nothing stronger to question their honesty. Speaking on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleagues who think with me in this matter, I lay an emphatic claim to having devoted such ability and intelligence as we possess to the consideration of this question and to laying the view which we have thus formed before this Legislative Council. I lay a still stronger and more emphatic claim to the integrity and honesty of purpose as well as of myself, however egotistical it may seem, as of those colleagues who hold the same views as I do upon this subject.

There is not the slightest doubt—and I have the best authority for saying it—that it was this breach of decorum that contributed not a little to accentuate the previous determination, openly declared in the Council, of the dissenting members, to retire from the Council Hall as soon as the amendment was lost. All enlightened and self-respecting Indians have approved of that course, and I refrain from saying anything more on the subject. But I repeat, Gentlemen, my conviction that for a genuine improvement in the material condition of the Indian peasantry the less of legislation there is the better. And what may it be asked, has been the effect of our land laws during the past twenty years? Were not each and all of them enacted with the single object of bettering the condition of the peasantry? Has that object been attained?

The very fact that they are still tinkering and tinkering them, now in the Punjab and the North-Western Provinces, now in Bombay and the Central Provinces, now in Bengal and Madras, under one form or another, is evidence conclusive of the non-fulfilment of the object. In short, the statute-book is groaning under the accumulated weight of the agrarian legislation of the last quarter of a century, without the slightest benefit to those on whose behalf it has been undertaken. Their net effect has been to aggravate the original economic evils which it was intended to cure. The legislative remedies have proved worse than the disease. While the peasant wants bread, the State makes him a present of its legislative abracadabras. Gentlemen, you cannot be unaware of the official reports which reach us from time to time of the return of material prosperity to the Fellaheen of Egypt. What may have been the chief cause which has led there, especially during the last seven years, to that prosperity? Has there been any land legislation of the character the various Indian administrations have passed within recent years? No; legislation is the last thing which Lord Cromer has thought of while improving the condition of the Egyptian cultivator. Why? It should be remembered that his Lordship was not unaware of the land laws of this country. As a matter of fact he was no unimportant member of the Viceregal Legislative Council, which introduced the Bengal Tenancy Act of 1883. Again, it was he who had, with the help of Sir David Barbour, made a semi-official enquiry into the condition of agriculture in the various provinces, the gross income of the ryot per acre, and collected all other kindred statistics. And yet Lord Cromer, as the Minister Plenipotentiary of the English Government in Egypt, in spite of his Indian experience, has eschewed all land legislation. Why? The answer is not far to seek. Because he was quite convinced that paper statutes never advanced the welfare of the Indian ryot. The means he employed were more practical. Firstly, he thoroughly understood that throughout the world the agriculturist suffers for want of the necessary credit and capital. With the assistance of these, the agriculturist could always be kept free from debt, and

be enabled to labour assiduously to improve the out-turn of his produce, with benefit to himself and the State. Secondly, Lord Cromer also knew that irrigation was the first essential where Nature was freakish in her seasonal bounties. No doubt, they have the Nile in Egypt, but that river has existed from time immemorial. It did not, however, prevent famines. What was wanted was a judicious distribution of water, and a system which stored it for use during a season of deficiency. Irrigation, therefore, was of paramount importance. The Fellaheen may have all the capital needed to till their land, but if the necessary water was not there, they could do little. Lord Cromer, with the eye of the practised and far-sighted statesman, devoted his attention to extended and improved irrigation. You all know the colossal irrigation works on the Atbara now going on. Thus by the establishment of a national bank, on rational principles which immediately meet the requirements of the Egyptian cultivator, and by extended irrigation works, Lord Cromer has been able most successfully to achieve the amelioration of that entity and lead him on to the path of comparative prosperity. But you will observe that if he has been able to accomplish so much, it is owing to the entire absence of the agrarian legislation of the kind which the autocrats who reign for five years in this country are so fond of introducing. Egypt for the last fifteen years has been singularly fortunate in possessing as its virtual ruler, without interruption, a British statesman of great pluck and energy, of foresight and immense experience, who unhampered has been allowed to work out his benevolent project for the benefit of the millions of Egypt. Once for all a broad and generous policy, far-reaching in its beneficent and vivifying influence, was laid down and it has been allowed to be carried into practical operation uninterrupted and unfettered by circumlocution, red-tape and a dozen other obstructive and contradictory elements more or less of a character how not to do it which are so rife in India.

EXTENSION OF VICEREGAL PERIOD

This fact leads me to offer one observation in this place. In India, it is highly expedient, as the *Times* of

India sagaciously observed two years ago in an article which may be read with profit at this juncture, that when we have a good Viceroy of a practical turn of mind, imbued with a deep sense of his responsibility and intent on rendering lasting good to the masses, as Lord Curzon seems to be by universal consent that he should be allowed to remain at the helm of affairs for a longer period than the orthodox one of five years, so that he may be in a position to achieve all the good which his knowledge and experience may have derived during the first term of his office. It is indeed most curious that a capable Viceroy, who is known to be rendering good, should have to lay down his office at the very time, or the psychological moment, when India has the greatest need of utilising to her best advantage his previously acquired experience.

EX PARTE OFFICIAL REPORTS ON LAND ASSESSMENTS

If, then, you ask me what remedies may be recommended to Government for extricating the ryot from his present condition of indebtedness, and gradually leading him on to the path of prosperity, I should reply that the fundamental reform, whence all other reforms must naturally flow, is a modification in the present policy of land-revenue assessment in vogue in the different provinces. For the last two years and upwards, thanks to Mr. R. C. Dutt and his untiring perseverance and patience, the controversy has been going on as to the oppressive character of the assessment. Here, too, there are two schools of thought—the official—which contends that the assessments are light, and the non-official, which avers to the contrary. Where there is such a diametrical difference of opinion, it is always best to find out the truth by exploding the fallacies lurking in the facts and arguments of either side. There ought to be a judicial pronouncement of the moot question, on the basis of reliable evidence which may be collected by means of an impartial tribunal specially appointed for the purpose. Unless such a judicial and exhaustive inquiry is undertaken and a final verdict pronounced, it is to be feared this controversy is likely to remain interminable. But it is wisdom that the sooner it is closed in the manner

suggested, the better. The future land-revenue policy should, then, be based on the ascertained opinion of that tribunal. But it will never do to flourish before us a mass of one-sided facts and arguments of Commissioners and Collectors as are to be found recorded in those precious serials of Survey Settlement Officers published from time to time. They are purely *ex parte* and not subject to the cross-examination necessary to arrive at the truth.

IRRIGATION *versus* RAILWAYS

Meanwhile extended irrigation works of all kinds, small and large, by means of canals, tanks, reservoirs, wells wherever practicable, and the harnessing so far as possible, after careful investigation, of some of the large rivers after the manner of the Godavary in the past by General Sir Arthur Cotton, are essential. Next, of course, is the stimulation of credit and capital; and, lastly, elementary education suited to a large rural population. It is, however, satisfactory to notice that after the experience of the two severe famines, the State has now taken the first step towards improving and extending existing irrigation and taking new works in hand. A Commission is already sitting on the subject, taking evidence under the presidency of a talented Engineer, who has been mainly instrumental in achieving success with irrigation works in Egypt. It is to be hoped that the report of Sir Colin Scott Moncreiff and his able colleagues may prove most practical. Our only regret is that the State should have for so many years subordinated irrigation works to railway construction at railway speed—a procedure against which your representative entered their protests before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. I would quote only one or two passages from the report of the Commission of 1879 to inform you how far the Indian Government had neglected the golden recommendations of that Commission, with the late Sir John Caird as its most expert member. It observed :

That among the means that may be adopted for giving India direct protection from famine arising from drought, the first place must unquestionably be assigned to works of irrigation

But the Government assigned it a second place only. Instead of appointing an Irrigation Commission which was the first essential, there was appointed in 1883 a Parliamentary Select Committee on Railways. Thus while 150 crores of rupees have been spent on railways since 1884, only twenty crores have been expended on irrigation. But I need not tarry to inform you of the beneficent results which by this time might have arisen from spending on wells and tanks even a fourth of the sum incurred on railways. Not that the Government was not made aware of the economic advantages to the State and the ryot alike of irrigation. For the Commission of 1879 further remarked that :

It has been too much the custom, in discussions as to the policy of constructing such works, to measure their value by their financial success, considered only with reference to the net return to Government on the capital invested in them. The true value of irrigation works is to be judged very differently. First must be reckoned the direct protection afforded by them in years of drought by the saving of human life, by the avoidance of the loss of revenue remitted, and of the outlay incurred in costly measures of relief.

Unfortunately this golden counsel, I repeat, was never taken into serious consideration till the Second Famine Commission of 1898 once more accentuated the advice, with some further pertinent observations to answer those who, in the interval, had waxed most eloquent on the wonderful miracles of railways. In paragraph 536 of its report, the Commission observes after referring to the expenditure on famine protective works, that :

Experience has shown that on the occasion of a widespread failure of the rains, railways, however useful and necessary they may be, do not keep down prices to a point at which the slightest pressure only is left. So far as they equalise prices, they widen the area of scarcity, though lessening the intensity elsewhere of famine. Though they bring grain to tracts liable to famine in years of drought, they also prevent large accumulation of grain in those tracts in years of plenty.

Thus railways have been no unmixed blessing. Moreover, it is now recognised that, after all, they are only a means of speedy distribution of grain from one place to another, but they in no way add a single rupee to the wealth of the country. But it has taken years to explode this fallacy at the seat of the Central authority. In these matters it would seem that the Government has been far behind the march of enlightened Indian opinion. It required three Commissions and two severe famines to recognise and become alive to the supreme importance of extended irrigation, wherever possible and practicable which, in the long run, actually stimulates agricultural wealth. The Famine Commission of 1879 openly said :

It is not only in years of drought that irrigation works are of value. In seasons of average rainfall they are of great service and a great source of wealth giving certainly to all the agricultural operations, increasing the outturn per acre of the crops and enabling more valuable descriptions of crops to be grown.

Next, in para 544 the Commission of 1898 has pointed out that since 1880, an average return of 6 per cent. net on capital outlay has been realised on irrigation works which can hardly be said of railways. On the contrary, the last are still losing something like a crore of rupees per annum to the general taxpayer. That I am not speaking at random on the subject of this net loss by railways, I have to draw your attention to the Appendix in the Report of the Royal Commission to which I have already alluded. It will be seen from it that in fifteen years there was a loss of over 51 crores. That, owing to low exchange, in late years there was a heavy loss on guaranteed railways may be admitted. But I may inform you that apart from these railways, almost 90 per cent. of the State lines have been hitherto losing concerns. The following statistics, which are worked out from the latest Table officially published in the *Gazette of India* of 6th July 1901, will make it evident to all what a drag on the annual revenue are the railways. In all there are 51 railways (excluding the East Indian) which lost from the

date of their construction up till 1900 to the State, Rs. 43,34,72,459. Of these six only show a net gain :

(1) Rajputana-Malwa	7.26 crores.
(2) Warora Colliery	0.10 "
(3) Eastern Bengal	1.10 "
(4) Nalhatti	0.01 "
(5) Patna-Gaya	0.09 "
(6) Lucknow-Bareilly	0.01 "
	8.57 crores.

The rest, namely 45 lines, have lost between them 51.91 crores. Thus, deducting the gain of the above six lines, the net result was a loss of 43.34 crores to the State? The total capital outlay of the six lines was 40 crores. The capital of the losing lines was 167.46 crores. The total capital equalled 207.46. On this the net loss was 43.34 crores. All these lines began to be constructed after 1870. If, therefore, we take it that they generally began to earn profits five years after the date of their completion and allow the older and new lines an average earning period of 20 years, we shall in no way be exaggerating the loss. Thus, these railways have lost on an average 20 per cent. in 20 years or, say, 1 per cent. per annum. This is the result. But it will interest you to know something of the principal losing lines.

	Capital in crores.	Loss from the begin- ning in crores.
	Rs.	Rs.
(1) North-Western Railway	... 50.71	... 25.33
(2) Oudh and Rohilkhand	... 12.56	... 3.39
(3) South Indian	... 7.53	... 2.79
(4) Southern Mahratta	... 9.82	... 4.36
(5) Indian Midland	... 10.31	... 2.86
(6) Bengal-Nagpur	... 17.51	... 2.00

I beg to draw your attention, Gentlemen, to the enormous loss on one line alone the North-Western Railway, which, on a capital of 50.71 crores has lost 25.33 crores. Of course, it is to a large extent a Military Railway. But I ask why the annual loss on such a railway,

which is purely constructed for Military purposes, is not debited to the Military Department just as all charges for mobilisation. You will observe that the above six lines alone make up more than half the total capital outlay and that they have managed to lose between them 40·73 crores or, say, nearly 40 per cent. to their capital! Contrast this railway finance, Gentlemen, with the total capital outlay from the beginning of 32 crores on irrigation works which, even after taking into account the non-productive or losing ones, have paid net 6 per cent. It should be remembered that even the East Indian Railway, with all its profits, does not yet yield to Government, after deducting the amount of profits payable to the Company which manages the line, more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum on its capital, according to the latest official return. Of course, I am aware of the fact that 50 years hence this railway would be the entire property of the State and would then form a most "valuable asset" against State liabilities. But, meanwhile, I think it is but right that I should point out to you its present paying character. You will thus see what has been the financial burden on the taxpayer of extended railways at breathless pace. Even admitting their utility, is it possible that any country, much less so poor a country as India, can afford the luxury of the annual losses described above? And what, it may be asked, is the fair market value of the losing concerns? Does the Government expect to realise anything near their respective book cost?

AGRICULTURAL BANKS

As to the agricultural banks, it is some consolation to notice that after well-nigh 20 years the project, due to the initiative of Sir William Wedderburn, has been revived and that the Government has recognised its importance. It is satisfactory also to notice the institution of an expert Committee to consider the practicability of the scheme from the point of view presented by the existing conditions. Opinions, however, seem to differ. The Committee has framed its scheme on the basis of the Co-operative Credit Societies on the Continent. Their

principal object is, no doubt, co-operative banking on a modest scale, with safeguards of a rigid character. Its principle is entirely voluntary. Friendly co-operation must take the lead. Where such co-operation is formed, it will have to regulate its practical proceedings on the lines formulated by the Committee. No doubt here and there some rudimentary Co-operative Societies are already in existence. The one in Multan is supposed to be doing well. On our Bombay side there is an agricultural syndicate, which has done some useful work and which needs development. These small institutions now in existence lead one to hope that after the passing of the present scheme by the legislature, there may be a genuine movement for the establishment of such Co-operative Credit Societies. A good start, with good management, is the first element of success. The *sowcar*, I mean the honest usurer, is not likely to view his rival with anything like friendliness or favour. At any rate, he will closely watch its proceedings. And if he finds in the end that the new Credit Institution is in no way inimical to his interests, he will slowly endeavour to recognise its importance. Whether in the process of time, which may be many years, he will entirely identify himself with these societies and become its guiding spirit and beneficent fairy is a problem. But anyhow the most satisfactory feature of this new scheme is the wisdom the Committee has exercised in recognising the absolute importance of the *sowcar* in the domestic economy of the ryot. To the Committee, he is not the black tyrant and blood-sucker that he has often been represented. After all, the Committee is aware that the enlightened self-interest of the State in India demands the existence of the *sowcar*. Without his aid, it would become impossible that the crores of land-revenue could be so punctually gathered from year to year.

CREDIT

So far, then, the scheme promises to be hopeful. Whether this kind of banking will eventually become popular and stimulate thrift and industry remains to be seen

In fact, thrift and industry are the two cardinal virtues of the Indian peasantry, despite all assertions to the contrary. What the ryot badly wants is capital and credit. As to capital, it must first exist in the country and as to credit it is a serious question whether with the new fangled legislation in vogue which has sought to restrict the right of transfer in land, credit will be improved. Good security means good credit. But where the former is next to non-existent, how the latter may be established is a question difficult to answer. The *sowcar*, whom the Committee invites to help the Co-operative Societies, will think twice and thrice how he may foster credit on nothing.

WANTED ELASTICITY AND SUCCESS OF THE EGYPTIAN SYSTEM

It is also a moot point whether the scheme has in it all those elements of elasticity to ensure fair success. Anyhow it is possible that, even after a full and fair trial, these societies will prove a success and not a failure as the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act. Again, my fear is that what is easily understood and practised by a European peasant is not possible to be understood and practised by an Indian ryot. The German farmer, for instance, thoroughly understands the principles of the Raiffesen System and profits by availing himself of the advantages offered by it. But is it possible that the illiterate Indian peasant can do so? Are not all his agricultural environments cast in a different mould from those of the German or Italian? It is a great mistake to slavishly follow the European system in this respect when, on the face of it, it is recognised as most unsuitable. I am, Gentlemen, personally more inclined to look with favour on the monetary system in vogue for the last six or seven years in Egypt to help the rural classes there. One reason, of all others, which inclines me to it is the great success that has already attended the operations of the Egyptian system. Bearing in mind that the Egyptian cultivator differs little from his Indian brother, it is safe to assume there are more chances of success in following it than the one about to be tried here. The National Bank in Egypt has an

autonomy of its own, and is every way unshackled in its operations save so far as the collection of instalments brings it into contact with Government. In its nature, I take it to be a refined edition of the *sowcar*, but without the *sowcar's* cupidity. The bank is quite content to earn but 10 per cent. on its monies, out of which it fully spends four on charges of collection and rural agency. It sends, like our local Insurance Companies, a large number of experienced and trustworthy agents to the various villages to ascertain the position of the applicants requiring capital. After due enquiries reports are made. On the basis of these reports advances are made, and instalments of an easy character are fixed. Collection of instalments is made, in which Government aid is taken. Hence there is a Controller appointed by Government to scrutinise all transactions. But beyond this there is no other State supervision. Such a practical scheme, already a great success, would have been preferable. I would recommend instituting one National Bank at least of the character established in Egypt in each Province of the Empire with its branches in the districts. But I entertain no dogmatic opinion on the subject. Nothing would give us greater satisfaction than to see a modest beginning made on the right lines which would attain the principal object we have all in view for the better improvement of the pecuniary condition of the Indian peasantry. Hence, a full and fair trial is essential. Experience may discover defects which might be remedied, and thus give greater permanence to it and offer better chances of success as years roll on.

As to education of the rural classes, it is unprofitable at present to say anything. The question of education is our despair. If even after well-nigh 50 years the Provincial Governments, in spite of growing revenues, cannot afford to spend directly from their respective treasuries an amount in the aggregate larger than a crore on all kinds of education, it is hopeless to expect that they would spend anything like a reasonable sum for the education of the rural classes. I, therefore, refrain from making further observations on this melancholy subject, though Lord Curzon has of late revived some hope.

in this direction which, it is much to be wished, may be fairly realised.

GRAIN STORAGE

In connection with this question of famine prevention, it is also essential to bear in mind whether the annual export of food-grains, chiefly wheat and rice, to foreign countries does not contribute somewhat to increase the intensity of famine when drought occurs. The quantity exported varies from year to year according to the demand, but the average of the last five years may be taken as 21 lakhs of tons per annum. The surplus left is not much. The Commission of 1898 came to the conclusion, after most elaborate calculations and searching tests, that :

Having regard to the degree to which the increase of population appears to have surpassed the increase of food crop areas, we are inclined to the belief that whatever may have been the normal annual surplus of food-grains in 1880, the present surplus cannot be greater than that figure.

The quantity was five million tons, but both Sir James Caird and Mr. Sullivan observed that they were "unable to place any confidence" in those figures. They computed that at the best the surplus was just enough to last ten days for the whole of the Indian population! Under the circumstances they strongly recommended the storage of grain, which was the immemorial practice in the country, and which continued till the system of payment of the State dues in cash instead of kind, and the indebtedness of the ryots, chiefly arising from enhanced revenue assessments, swept it away. Sir James and his colleague remarked that :

In a country where annual surplus of grain is so small and where it cannot be increased by foreign importation, the absolute need of reserves in seasons of scarcity for the supply of places difficult of access, becomes almost imperative. The most effectual remedy for this would be to encourage the storage of grain in such localities in seasons of plenty.

They recommended that Government should do, through the village officials, for the safety of the poorer classes, what the wealthier now do for themselves. The

people live on different varieties of dry grain, grown in their several districts, which is the specific food they are accustomed to. As this common grain is rarely an article of export, its storage could in no way interfere with the operation of foreign trade, and, as the storage would be sub-divided in every village, it could be done without disturbance to the usual operations of husbandry. In seasons of abundance, stores may very conveniently be made. A village of 400 inhabitants, cultivating 400 acres of grain, may be reckoned to have 40 of the class for whom the storage is proposed. It was estimated that a store of 7 tons would suffice for this number during a year of famine, and the quantity required might be secured out of two years of good crops during the interval at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ tons for each year, without any pressure on the rest of the people, while the storage of that quantity of grain would be a simple and inexpensive operation. The value of these practical suggestions has in no way been diminished even after the lapse of twenty years. On the contrary, the importance of storage is deemed of more paramount necessity for the future than in 1880 after the experience of the two recent calamitous visitations. Storage is an indispensable condition of safety, specially having regard to the continued exports and the greater poverty of the masses. The less the stocks of surplus grain, the higher the prices when a severe drought overtakes the country. But a large rise in the prices of food-grains signifies so much starvation to the poor who are unable to buy them. It is a matter of regret that this point of view is seldom borne in mind by the officials. Even if present to their mind, they take no steps to remedy the evil. The depletion of food-stores is an evil. The abundance of it means low prices, as the deficiency of it means the contrary. Then, as the masses are poor, they cannot buy the grain at famine prices, so that the inevitable result is starvation and death. Hence it is essentially imperative that situated as the Indian masses are, storage in the simple and inexpensive way suggested by Sir James Caird should be one of the means whereby famines may be prevented, and hitherto I do not

think I have noticed any very serious objection being raised against it.

OTHER SUGGESTIONS

It is not suggested that Government should have public granaries at special centres. Neither is it suggested that arrangements for storing grain should be made for the benefit of "thieves and rats" as Mr. O'Connor cynically observed when replying to a question of the Famine Commissioners of 1898. No; the latest Famine Commission has strongly recommended relief works as far as possible nearer the homes of the famished. Relief within a short distance of villages is advocated. And it is in this connection that the system, as recommended by Sir J. Caird, or in its more modified form, free from all objections, as was very wisely suggested in the columns of the *Statesman* in August 1900, fits in admirably well and is, therefore, deserving of a fair trial, and I say this, in face of Lord Curzon's declaration at Budget time that he would doubt the sanity of those who recommended grain storage. We have an eminently successful trial in this matter, which also can be easily followed. Mr. Parvati Chowdry, a zemindar, has admirably succeeded, by establishing "Dharma Gola" in his own villages, and his "Note" on the same subject, alluded to in a recent issue of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, requires respectful attention from the authorities. I have now exhausted the subject of the prevention of famines. It is to be earnestly hoped that the practical lessons of the two famines will be seriously borne in mind, for it goes without saying that the consequences of another visitation of the character and intensity of the last is certain to add to the difficulties and anxieties of the Government. Even the *Times*, with all its desire to echo the optimism prevailing at Calcutta and Westminster, is constrained to observe that :

It may well be doubted whether a day is not coming when not all the resources of the British Empire will suffice to cope with a succession of bad seasons and a final failure of the rains over an extended area.

This is an ominous warning, of which those responsible should not fail to take note.

CONDITION OF THE MASSES

I would now crave leave to rivet your attention on what has been a burning question for many a year—I mean the condition of the masses. All are agreed that India, compared with the countries of Europe and the Far West, is poor. At the same time it is alleged that the standard of living is low, and, therefore, the prevailing poverty is not of an appalling character. It is, indeed, natural for our alien rulers that they should resent any serious allegation which might in any way reflect on the character of their rule. It is certainly not pleasant for any civilised Government to be told that its people are steeped in abject poverty and that that poverty, according to all symptoms, is growing. But when such a disagreeable statement is made, practical statesmanship suggests that its correctness or incorrectness should be conclusively demonstrated. For such a purpose two courses are open. Either the Government, against whom the allegation is made, should court a full and fair inquiry in *coram populo*, say, by means of a disinterested and imperial tribunal of experts, reputed for sifting evidence of irrefragable facts gathered from each district, and probing the truth to the bottom; or it should collect through its own trusted officers such reliable statistics as shall enable the public to draw its own inference one way or the other. In my own opinion, the first method is preferable to the second. An open inquiry in broad daylight, conducted from district to district, where witnesses could be put through the searching test of cross-examination as regards average produce in a given series of years, their average value, the range of wages, the cost of living, the saleable price of land itself, and all other circumstances essential to a right understanding of the true conditions of the people, is the most satisfactory. If the seal of public confidence is to be set on such an investigation, it is superfluous to observe that publicity and close examination of facts are absolutely essential. Unfortunately, for reasons best known to itself, the Government has shrunk from instituting such an open inquiry, though more than once appealed to. In India, it is

always so difficult to conquer the hydra of hide-bound officialism.

METHOD OF COMPUTING NATIONAL WEALTH

The second method is departmental. It is the one which the Indian Government has twice adopted, one in 1882 and another in 1888. But it is deemed extremely unsatisfactory, for in its nature it is secretive. Circulars are sent round to the district officers to make inquiries. The public never knows what are the instructions conveyed to them and what may be the scope allowed to the officers, because the circulars are marked "confidential". Accordingly, "confidential" reports are made to which "confidential" replies are given. The results are embodied in a "confidential" despatch to the Secretary of State. If some member of Parliament is inquisitive enough to ask that functionary whether he would place it on the table of the House, he obligingly answers in the affirmative on the understanding that the papers should be considered "confidential". They are never allowed to be published for general information. This bureaucratic mode in State affairs, in which the public are vitally interested, can never inspire any confidence. And the publication of mere extracts, which their own self-complacent optimism may choose to select, cannot satisfy public curiosity, much less carry conviction home. Of this nature was the inquiry very hurriedly made during the closing months of the Viceroyalty of Lord Dufferin. Selected facts and extracts from the "confidential" reports of district officials were afterwards published in the official *Gazette*. But it cannot be said that there was any systematic attempt at computing the annual income, agricultural and non-agricultural. That was only done once during the Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon in 1883. Sir David Barbour was entrusted with the work. He calculated that the income from all sources was Rs. 27 per head against Rs. 20 computed by Mr. Dadabhoi Naoroji. But the details of the figures by which the aggregate was arrived at were never disclosed. Some official figures, however, had found publicity through members of Parliament. And ten years later,

Mr. Dadabhoi, when in the House of Commons, put a series of elaborate interpellations in the matter. On 6th April 1893, he asked the Under-Secretary :

Whether in 1882 the Finance Minister of India estimated the average income of each inhabitant of India at Rs. 27 per head; whether the estimates were based upon the contents of a Note entitled "An Enquiry into the Incidence of Taxation in British India," prepared by Sir David Barbour; and whether the Note contained the following particulars :

Agricultural Wealth per Head of the Population.

Presidency or Province.	Rate per head. Rupees.
Bombay	... 22'4
Central Provinces	... 21'6
Madras	... 19'0
Punjab	... 18'5
N.-W. Provinces and Oudh	... 16'4
Bengal	... 16'9
Burmah	... 27'6

I may mention that Sir Evelyn Baring had referred to the above identical figures in his speech in the same year that they were worked out at the introduction of the Bengal Tenancy Act. At the time the value of the agricultural income was calculated at 332 crores of rupees. Including Burma and Assam it was 350 crores. The non-agricultural income was put down at 175 crores. The total was 525 crores. This sum, divided by the population of the day, viz., 19'45 crores, gave Rs. 27 per head. In the same Note, the value of the gross produce of the different provinces was given as follows :

	Crores Rupees.
Punjab	... 34'15
N.-W. Provinces and Oudh	... 71'15
Bengal	... 103'60
Central Provinces	... 21'25
Bombay	... 89'00
Madras	... 50'00

GOVERNMENT DECLINES TO PUBLISH DETAILS

The result of the interpellation was that the Secretary of State declined to lay the full Note of Sir David Barbour, referred to by Mr. Dadabhoy, on the table of the House. Mr. Dadabhoy further moved to have a similar return made for submission to Parliament based on the latest statistics available till 1893; but this also was refused. So far, it will be seen that the Government was disinclined to take the public into its confidence, much less to allow it to offer by the publication of all the details a sound and healthy criticism thereon. The estimates, moreover, were all made out in secret, and the broad results alone were made known. What were the actual details of each province, namely, the quantity of agricultural produce, the several prices at which it was computed, and so forth, were never disclosed. Hence there was no means of testing the accuracy of the figures. In October 1900, at Simla, and later on, at Budget time in March last at Calcutta, Lord Curzon observed that his latest estimates of agricultural income showed Rs. 20 per head against Rs. 18 in 1880. Here, too, we have practically not been informed of the details on which the estimates have been worked out. Hence the public interested in the question have no means of testing the accuracy of the statement. Both, frankly admits Lord Curzon, are mere estimates. The data are not "incontrovertible". "There is an element of conjecture in them, but so there was in the figures of 1880." It will be thus perceived that after all both estimates have been pronounced by the highest authority as merely conjectural. But Mr. O'Connor, the Director-General of Statistics, whose department furnishes all statistics, goes even a step further than the Viceroy. Asked by the Hon'ble Mr. Bose, one of the members of the Famine Commission of 1898, whether, as matters stood, it was possible "to estimate with any degree of total accuracy the total food-supply in the country", he replied as follows:—

I tried to make an estimate when the famine broke out a year ago, but abandoned the attempt finding it was not possible to work it out satisfactorily. We do not even know accurately the area of

production of food-grains. I think the estimates in Bengal are extremely defective; then, we do not know the areas in the Native States; in the Madras Presidency we have no information as regards large tracts; in fact, our information is fragmentary" *vide* page 5, Indian Famine Commission Report, 1898, Appendix 7. Vol. I.

After such an authoritative declaration by the Director-General of Statistics himself, it is needless to observe that no scientific statistician or any statistical society of reputation, such as the Royal Statistical Society of England, would accept either set of statistics of agricultural income, unless they could be scientifically verified. But verification implies, in the first instance, all details; and, in the second place, absolute accuracy. When we bear in mind that the different provinces are differently situated, with different out-turns of food and non-food crops, with varying prices and wages, it is no light task to bring the data of all the different provinces to a common denomination and deduce results therefrom which might be reasonably accepted as correct. Moreover, the very method of computation should proceed on recognised scientific principles. Next, if one period is to be compared with another, it is necessary to take into consideration a series of good and bad years, so that there may be every probability of coming nearer to the truth. For instance, if the last computation of the annual income was made in 1880, and if, for purposes of comparison, another is to be made at present, it is essential to take into account the total agricultural income during the last twenty years and strike an annual average. We do not know whether the figures quoted by Lord Curzon have been worked out on this principle, otherwise it is entirely misleading to take the year 1900 only and base a comparison thereon. Indian harvests are subject to such violent fluctuations that unless a series of fat and lean years are taken together, it would not be right to select certain years and reject others. So far as to the statistics themselves. But further care is necessary to see that the system of computation itself, which may be adopted in one period, is the same as that is adopted in another if a fair comparison is to be made. All exceptional factors in each period should be eliminated

and the constant factors brought on an identical level. For these reasons it would be unsafe to accept the estimate given by Lord Curzon at the last Budget time. And more unsafe still would it be to institute a comparison with the figures of 1880 and attempt to draw an inference therefrom, be it favourable or unfavourable. To take one instance only. What may have been the produce per acre in 1880, and what may it have been on an average during the twenty years which ended with 1900? Lord Curzon has told us that in 1880 the yield was computed at 730 lbs., while his own estimates are based on 840 lbs. But he offers us no proof in support of the statement! Here, too, the public is not made aware of the details which could be verified. We are always advised by the authorities to verify our own facts before submitting them for their consideration. Are we not in turn entitled to ask Government to give us conclusive proofs of their own facts touching agricultural income? Even assuming the out-turn of 840 lbs. per acre for both periods, it would seem that taking the quantity produced per head of the population, the result would show that in 1880 it was 793 lbs., and in 1900, it was 740 lbs. Then, again, can we rely on the prices as annually recorded for food and non-food crops published in the yearly statistical serial when experts discard them as valueless, they being all the figures on a fixed day either in January or July? Again, the retail prices which are more or less compiled on hearsay by the semi-illiterate village accountant, can hardly be relied upon.

AN EXPERT COMMISSION IMPERATIVE

It is almost unprofitable under the circumstances to pursue these official statistics, of which no details are offered for purposes of examination and verification. If the Viceroy is anxious to prove to the world that both agricultural and non-agricultural income has increased during the last twenty years, he would be greatly assisting the independent public by placing before it all evidence in full detail, which could be tested on principles which scientific statisticians have formulated. Either, then, this evidence must be made available to the public, or a public

inquiry should be instituted. The value of the latter methods of investigation cannot be too highly rated. For what has been the case for years past? The school of pessimists, at whose head is the veteran Mr. Dadabhoj, observe that their own detailed inquiry, based on statistics supplied by the officials themselves, leads them to infer that the annual income now is less than what it was in 1880. Mr. Digby is the latest and most capable exponent of that statement. I need not refer to the elaborate open letter he addressed some months since to Lord Curzon. You have all perused it, and each of you could judge for yourself after verifying his figures. On the other hand, the optimists, who almost all belong to the governing class, contend, as Lord Curzon did in March last, that, the movement is for the present distinctly in a forward and not in a retrograde direction; that there is more money, not less, in the country; that the standard of living among the poorer classes is going up, not down.

Thus, the one school directly contradicts the other. As far as the pessimists are concerned, I have already stated that they were for testing the accuracy of the figures of 1880, and hence an appeal was made to the Secretary of State in Parliament to publish all the details. But that official shrank from courting the critical examination for which they were wanted. It is scarcely intelligible why that functionary should have adopted an attitude of *non-possumus* in this respect. The object of both schools is to reach the bottom of the truth. If, then, the truth regarding the present condition of the people, as compared with what it was in 1880, is to be ascertained and placed beyond all cavil, why should there be such a reticence about making all information available to the public? It is the duty of every just and well-organised Government to find out whether prosperity is decreasing or increasing among its subjects. If it be decreasing, the causes of such should be discovered so as to remove them. Shepherds of people, as Bacon says, must needs know the disorders in a State of which economic ones are the chief. If that be the political axiom of all Governments, ought it not, *a fortiori*, to be the axiom of an alien Government like

that of the British? Gentlemen, I will give you an instance. Italy, after the return of King Victor Emmanuel to Rome, was in an extremely bad plight. The condition of the people was miserable. For some years things went on from bad to worse. The tendency was to allow the economic situation to drift. But at last the day of reckoning came, and the Government was forced to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition and discover what was the real national wealth. It was presided over by Count Jacine, and the investigation proceeded on lines suggested by scientific statisticians. Lord Curzon has, during the three years of his Viceroyalty, nominated at least four Commissions. What is there to prevent him from appointing a fifth one, of independent experts, European and Indian, to determine the true national income and set at rest this long pending controversy? In my opinion, such an inquiry has become imperative, and that would be the wisest statesmanship which could adopt such a course. It is, however, a matter of regret that, on the one hand, the Government and its apologists in the Press, both here and in England, resent the statement of the pessimists and try to discredit the figures, which are really supplied by itself; on the other hand, it refuses to give publicity to all the details on which it founds its own deduction as to the improvement in the condition of the masses. It is not unnatural if, under such a condition, there is no popular confidence in official statistics, while popular pessimism grows apace and derives fresh emphasis from the actual economic phenomena to be witnessed before their very eyes. The Government should not, therefore, fight shy of the proposed inquiry, be the result what it may, for it is a serious question, vitally affecting the welfare of millions of people. If, on the one hand, it is found that the national income has increased, the present bogey of the pessimists will at once be laid low. The people will be rejoiced to learn that, in spite of calamitous visitations, they are progressing favourably. On the other hand, if it is ascertained that after all there is growing impoverishment, it would be well for the optimistic school, at whose head are the Secretary of State and

the Viceroy, to drop their complacent optimism and strive to remedy the evil by stimulating agricultural and other industries. The Government of India years ago accepted the postulate, as was laid down by the Famine Commission of 1879, that the ultimate object of the Government should be to maintain agricultural and other operations at the highest attainable standard of efficiency. In its despatch twelve years ago, it fully acknowledged its responsibility in the matter. It admitted that the cultivators and their families, and their cattle must be properly fed and their needs for labour, irrigating, machinery and agricultural implements adequately met. Insufficiency of food, as well as deterioration or lack of such mechanical appliances, must diminish the effectiveness of labour, and thereby reduce the produce of the country. Hence the Government cannot divest itself of the responsibility of allowing agricultural operations to be maintained at that high standard.

EVIDENCE ON THE CONDITION OF THE MASSES

This being the recognised responsibility of the Government, let me put before you the evidence which is to be found in official papers and reports as to the actual condition of the masses at present. I need hardly refer to the result of the inquiry made during Lord Dufferin's time, fully familiar as you are all with it. It was bad enough in all conscience, though, to avoid disquietude at home, it was represented that it need cause "no anxiety at present". But what has been the condition of the self-same masses since? Let me quote the words of the report of the Famine Commission of 1898:

This section is very large, and includes the great class of day-labourers and the least skilled of artizans. So far as we have been able to form a general opinion upon a difficult question from the evidence we have heard and the statistics placed before us, the wages of these people have not risen in the last twenty years in due proportion to the rise of prices of the necessaries of life. The experience of the recent famine fails to suggest that this section of the community has shown any large command of resources or any increased powers of resistance. Far from contracting, it seems to be gradually widening, particularly in the more congested districts.

Its sensitiveness or liability to succumb, instead of diminishing, is possibly becoming more accentuated, as larger and more powerful forces supervene and make their effects felt where formerly the result was determined by purely local conditions.

The accentuation, it is needless to say, came two years later on with a vengeance, and it is now a matter of history how at the very outset of famine conditions in 1899, millions swarmed to the relief camps, absolutely prostrated and without any means whatever to buy food. I leave it to you, Gentlemen, to contrast this dismal state of affairs with the general statement made in the Council by Lord Curzon in March last, as to the growing improvement and better standard of living. I leave it to you to judge whether you can reconcile the one condition with the other.

TWO SALIENT STATEMENTS OF THE VICEROY TRAVERSED

Leaving the question alone, it may not be amiss to one or two other salient points in Lord Curzon's Budget speech. He is reported to have said that in a country largely dependent for its maintenance on agriculture, the time must come when the agricultural income must cease to grow by reason, firstly, of increase of population and, secondly, by the limit of land further available for cultivation. Under such a condition, it is prudent for a far-sighted Government to stimulate non-agricultural sources of wealth. None will dispute the general accuracy of the second statement, but is it proved that after a certain limit is reached, there cannot be any more agricultural productivity? It may be that the land is not so well cultivated as it ought to be; that owing to variety of reasons, want of capital, measure, and so forth, a plot of land may be capable of growing a larger quantity of product but cannot do so. As far as India is concerned, the best experts, from Sir John Caird to Mr. Voelcker and Mr. Leather, have unhesitatingly declared that there is every reason to expect that, with better means and resources, the productivity of the soil might be largely increased. When India can only grow 9 bushels of wheat

per acre, for instance, against 30 and more produced in Europe and America, it goes without saying that the proposition, as laid down by the Viceroy, cannot be universally predicated. Certainly, it cannot be so predicated of India. It is, therefore, the duty of his Lordship's Government to do all in its power to stimulate that productivity. In the proportion that the economic condition of the ryot is improved, will there be a corresponding improvement in the country's agriculture. Unfortunately, it is notorious that up till now the Indian Government has practically done next to nothing to promote agricultural industry in a way to induce greater prosperity to the peasantry. On the contrary, the evidence almost everywhere is to discourage that industry by a variety of harsh measures, legislative and executive. A considerable relaxation or modification of those measures is the first necessity. But so far the State seems to stuff its ears with cotton when appeals are made to it for lightening the burden of land assessments. It should not be forgotten that the revenue was formerly paid in kind, which in times of drought was every way better suited to the ryot than the present one of cash. Moreover, now-a-days the ryot's crops are mortgaged, even before being harvested. However high the price may be for its crops, he realises little profit out of it for himself. He is in no way better, perhaps worse. It is the middleman who is enriched. To the ryot only the load of indebtedness becomes greater. All these facts have to be duly weighed when it is light-heartedly asserted that it is impossible for Government to further stimulate agricultural industry. It is in its power to do so, as I have just suggested. If I may be allowed to offer an opinion on this subject, I would venture to say that agriculture in the country can still be made a great deal more productive. But this is not possible so long as the Government fails in its primary duty. The pressure of the land-revenue system being relieved, and other undue severities of forest and other laws which affect the domestic economy of the masses, being relaxed, agriculture must materially improve. But the State refuses to recognise

that assessments are heavy. As a matter of fact, however, it arrives at the conclusion because it has not yet cared to find out what is the real ratio which the gross produce bears to the assessment, and what surplus actually remains in the hands of the ryot after all charges of cultivation, interest on loans, etc., are deducted. It is quite possible to conceive of the gross agricultural income increasing and yet the net income of the producer a diminishing quantity. This aspect of the question also demands attention.

THE MONOGRAPH OF SIR EDWARD LAW ON
ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Then let me briefly refer to the so-called facts of "economic progress" with which the Finance Minister so regaled us in his last Financial Statement. He says that, "close examination of certain material facts will afford further proof that recuperative powers are no idle assumption". Sir Edward Law then refers to a few figures of recent imports and exports, to the consumption of salt, savings bank deposits and so forth. As to imports and exports, can any sound inference as to the real commercial progress of the people be drawn from merely exhibiting superficial figures of a triennial period? But Sir Edward's statements are open to so many challenges that all I can do in this place is to put the following queries to which, it is to be hoped, he will make an effort to reply fully, supported by irrefragable evidence, next Budget day. None will be more glad than myself to see a very satisfactory answer to every one of them: What are the scientific data on which to base the theory of the commercial prosperity of any country? Can India, which is a debtor country, and withal subject to foreign rule, be ever commercially prosperous when the naked fact of an annually increasing indebtedness and a large balance of exports, for which there is no return, is to be clearly seen? Can the abstraction of at least thirty crores of the national produce of the country, year in and year out, without the slightest hope of return, ever point to "recuperative" resources or tend to any material accumulation of the

surplus national capital which, in other countries, develops true trade, arts, industries, and manufactures? Is it true that the large imports in piece-goods, in metals, in railway and building materials, in sugar, and so forth, are entirely or mostly on account of foreign capital, temporarily invested in this country? Is it true that the large exports in rice, in cotton, in jute, in oil-seeds, in tea, and so forth are entirely or mostly on account of foreign capital, temporarily invested in this country? If true, where would the so-called commerce of the country be if there were an absolute withdrawal of that foreign capital? Apart from these facts, where is the evidence that in the consumption of the articles required by the masses there has been any progress worth speaking of during the last twenty-five years *pari passu*, with the growth of the population? Are the masses in a position to buy to-day even a single yard more per annum of Lancashire goods than they were in 1875? How much of the metals now imported belong to foreign capital, and how much to indigenous capital? Has the State ever taken out fair statistics of the percentage of imports and exports belonging to Native States? Has it done so similarly for the foreign capitalists? And has it found out what is the real share of the people of British India; and, if so, what was that share per head of the population in 1875 and in 1900? Has the consumption of salt per head of the population since 1886-87 increased or diminished? Was it not 33,729,954 maunds in that year, and was it not 35,727,256 maunds in 1900-1901? In other words, is it not the fact that in 1886-87, the consumption per head was 13.9 lbs. and in 1899-1900, 12.7 lbs.? Is that a sign of the prosperity of the masses or a deterioration in their condition? Is it true that large balances at Post Office Savings Banks signify greater prosperity? If so, may it be asked how is it that the deposits per head, which came in 1889-90 to Rs. 164, have since steadily gone down till ten years later they came down to Rs. 125? Is that phenomenon to be seen in the savings of people in Europe, in the United Kingdom, and in the United States? On the whole, it would be rash to share the opinion of the Viceroy and his Finance Minister

that the condition of the people is undergoing improvement. The positive evidence is against the statement. Where there is no reserve, no accumulation, no wealth, where millions live from hand to mouth on a bare wage, from season to season, on a low diet, it is rather bold to assert that there is increasing prosperity. Rather we are obliged to agree with the Duke of Argyll, who had not studied in vain the economics of India, that

of poverty and of destitution, more or less temporary and among individuals in European countries, we know. But of chronic poverty, and of permanent reduction to the lowest level of subsistence, such as prevail only too widely among the vast population of rural India, we have no example in the Western world.

Thus, poverty must be admitted as the normal condition of India. It can only be dispelled by a wise, gradual and continuous betterment of the poor. The three E's of Count Tolstoi are necessary for the country's welfare, namely, Enrichment, Enlightenment and Emancipation from superstition and oppressive burdens.

THE ECONOMIC EVILS OF ABSENTEEISM

It is to be feared, Gentlemen, that so long as absenteeism which is the principal feature of British Rule, exists, it is not possible to see any improvement. The abstraction from year to year to foreign parts of the national produce to the extent of thirty or forty crores without any hope of return, is considered the greatest obstacle in the way of national prosperity. The fact cannot be denied that the sterling obligations have increased from ten millions in 1874 to eighteen millions sterling. It must be admitted that the annual resources of the Indian people to that extent are drained away to foreign parts for which there is absolutely no return. Whatever the causes which lead to these obligations, there can be no gainsaying the economic results of that process of abstraction. The obligations we all know consist of pensions and allowances to European officials, interest on railways, stores, and so forth. But it should be remembered that the payments are compulsory, that is to say, they have not been voluntarily incurred by the people. In fact, the consent of the Indians has never been taken in the matter. Secondly,

the payments by themselves are considered excessive. Nowhere in the civilised world are higher salaries and pensions paid than in England. But as a matter of fact the salaries, pensions and allowances paid to European agency in this country are even greater than those allowed in England. So far they are unparalleled. The difference between the present rulers of India and their predecessors consists in this that, while the latter employed the indigenous agency and lived in the country, the former govern by their own, which is imported. However heavy or burdensome or tyrannical the taxation may have been in the case of the former rulers, the economic effects were not so disastrous as they are at present. I do not here raise the question even of the *justice* of the payments. That, again, would lead us to another branch of the controversy. My object here is to point out, solely and exclusively, the mischievous economic aspect of the costly foreign agency. Let us, for argument's sake, admit that the payments are just; but I ask every enlightened and fair-minded person, official and non-official, whether or not a country must grow poorer for the ceaseless drain of 30 to 40 crores of its annual wealth—the fruit of the children of the soil—without any return. Just consider the aggregate amount of this drain since 1860. It comes to 624 crores, without taking into account all private remittances in shape of profits of merchants, traders and planters. At the very least these should come to 300 crores, say, a total of 900 crores. But I entirely leave the last out of account and confine myself to the officially recorded figures of the Government's Home Remittances only, and I appeal to the economic sense of our rulers to say whether such a colossal abstraction from year to year is not the real cause of the poverty of India. If these 624 crores had remained in the country, what might have been the condition of the people to-day? Capital accumulates capital. Take a single instance of a specific character. Here are 180 indigenous cotton mills; of these 81 are in the city of Bombay. How have they multiplied? Is it not the case that the very earnings or savings of capital

made by the dozen or two dozen at the beginning have tended to a large extent to multiply the concerns? But if capital accumulates capital, how may it be possible without any accumulation worth mentioning that India can grow richer, that it can embark on new and profitable industrial enterprises? It is superfluous to refer to the axiom of the economists that industry is limited by capital; that where there is a lack of capital, it is not possible to foster arts and manufactures and industries. If, then, the fountain-source, instead of being replenished, is annually being drained away, is it an exaggeration to say that the time may come, unless other intervening factors neutralise their effect, when the process of exhaustion must bring its own nemesis. The fact is, India is not free to choose its own administrative agency. Were it free, is there the slightest doubt that the entire administrative agency would be indigenous living and spending their monies in the country? India, I repeat, is not free, and, therefore, it has no choice in the matter. The governing authorities, in the first place, have most strangely willed that almost all the higher posts shall be held by men, who live a while here, and then retire to their own country. Even another great modern Asiatic power, Russia, is not known to import wholesale Russian agency to carry on the work of administration in the distant provinces of Central Asia! But we are told that the European agency is extremely limited. It counts no more than 17,300 persons. True. But contrast the annual expenditure of 16 crores incurred on their account with the $2\frac{3}{4}$ crores earned by Indians. Did England sit quiet while the Plantagenets were filling all the high offices from France to the great disadvantage of the English themselves? Was not England pauperised when the Papacy was rampant and abstracted millions from it annually, as history has recorded? Would England refrain from complaining, supposing that the position of India and England was to-day reversed?

ASIATIC POVERTY

The grievous error is, that the present system of administration is not regulated by economic laws. Again,

while India is characterised by what may be called Asiatic poverty, our rulers govern it on principles of what may be called Asiatic immoderateness. In Asia, everything is on a colossal scale, its mountains and rivers, its seething population, and so forth. In fact, as an accomplished writer has observed :

Nothing in Asia is sufficiently restricted : empires are too big, populations are too vast ; all features of Nature are too huge ; the arts are too gigantesque ; the powers entrusted to men are too powerful ; calamities are too widespread ; all things have in them a truce of immoderateness as if gods and men alike had lost the sense of wise limitation . . . Everything from the powers of kings and the conceptions of men to the forces of Nature is gigantic, enormous, fatiguing to the brain. In fact, when measured, as all things must be measured, all things by a standard of which man is the unconscious unit, is immoderate.

While the country is poor, it is ruled at a cost unheard of in any part of the civilised world. It is thus that poor as India is, it is being made poorer by the economic anomalies which our Western Rulers have unfortunately introduced into the country. It is, of course, argued on the other side that though the administration is costly, it is of a superior character to that which the Indians, had they been free, might have had. True. But the Indians then would have cut their coat according to their cloth. And as they grew richer by commerce and manufactures, they might have, in a natural way, aspired to higher standards of civilised government. But it would have been folly for India to have risen at once to a pitch of the highest form of civilised government without counting the cost—millions which it could not have afforded and which must have eventually ruined it. In short, no country can with impunity continue to offend the laws of economy, which are based on Nature herself. The justification urged, therefore, can hardly stand. As an able economist has observed in the *Statesman* on this question, I will say :

Admitting, for argument's sake, that the defence of the existing system, so far as it rests on facts, is a good one, it is good in respect only of payments to Europeans made for such services as could not be performed by Indians consistently with the country's

welfare, and in respect of such payments only so far as they are not excessive. Any other payments made for the services of Europeans are clearly payments made for the benefit, not of India, but of the ruling race.

But I cannot further expatiate on this burning question. All I can say is, that England is doing the greatest injustice in this matter to India for which she shall have one day to pay most dearly. The whole question of the agency of administration demands radical reform. As Mr. N. N. Ghose shrewdly observed in his able Provincial Conference Address, at Midnapur, the two great branches of the Service are now an anachronism, and the time must come, however it may be artificially protracted, when there will have to be a fundamental change based on justice and equity, in spite of monopolies and powerful vested interests. Meanwhile, it is our duty to press this subject from time to time before the British Public and educate it to realise the enormity of the economic evils arising from the erroneous policy pursued at present and the incalculable advantage of economy and efficiency for the welfare of the masses, certain to accrue from the full and free employment of Indians in the higher grades of the Services.

INDIAN FINANCE

This brings us to the question of Indian Finance generally. At so late an hour, it would be tiring your patience to dilate at length on it. But when we are exultingly told of the recuperative resources of India, and the miracles which a succession of Finance Ministers are supposed to have wrought, we cannot but smile at the complacency of those who indulge in such high-coloured optimism. Our attention is directed to fat surpluses, which are no more surpluses than indirect transfers of property from the pockets of the voiceless taxpayers to the coffers of the omnipotent tax-eaters. It may be an ingenious, but not an ingenuous, way of raising the wind—this device of creating a surplus by debasing the currency and putting into circulation the rupee at 16 pence when it is only worth 11 pence. It is further observed that this nostrum has steadied

exchange and relieved in a measure the Indian treasury of the heavier burden of the Home remittances. It is, however, curiously forgotten that not all the steadiness of exchange in the world can reduce by a feather's weight the true burden of the taxpayer. He has, anyhow, to remit 18 millions sterling annually. As things go, the remittance has to be made in the shape of exports of produce, which is part of the annual wealth of the country. In reality, produce equivalent in value to that amount has to be sent year after year, be the exchange what it may. Be it 12 or 24 pence, it makes not the slightest difference to the taxpayer in the burden he has to bear.

NO TRUE SURPLUS

But apart from the meretricious methods of balancing the annual Budget, whereby deficits are converted into surpluses and *vice versa*, let me enquire whether India has anything like a *true* surplus of revenue. Such able and accomplished Finance Ministers as Sir John Strachey and Lord Cromer have placed on record their deliberate opinion that there is none. When the State incurs debt from year to year, and has managed to pile quite an Ossa of loans, whether for productive or non-productive purposes, amounting to 317 crores without the slightest attempt at repayment of it by means of a sinking fund, it is idle to talk of surpluses, more especially when the "assets" do not represent "the commercial value of the undertakings"—mostly your losing railways—as the Secretary of State is obliged to remind members of Parliament in his annual "explanatory memorandum".

TAXATION, ARTIFICIAL CURRENCY AND ITS MULTIFOLD EVILS

Moreover, it is forgotten that the so-called surpluses of recent years have been obtained by means of extra taxation, which has been raised from time to time since the era of the Penjdeh scare and the seizure of Upper Burma. The licence tax was converted into income-tax in 1886; next, the salt duty was enhanced by 8 annas per

maund ; later on, the import duty of 5 per cent. on all articles of merchandise, save coal and machinery, was levied ; and lastly, the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty on cotton fabrics. Each time the taxation was levied or enhanced, the plea put forth was low exchange, though it was pointed out that the plea was a hollow one. The annual average increase in this new and enhanced taxation comes to 7 crores of rupees. It was all ear-marked, successive Viceroy's having openly promised, as may be ascertained on a reference to their speeches in the Council, that it would be remitted as soon as the finances permitted. Exchange was the continuous burden of their song ; but exchange, according to their own boast, is now stable. The necessity, therefore, of the enhanced taxes has ceased to exist. But it is a matter of regret to have to state that the public faith in the matter of this taxation has not been kept. Public faith has been greatly shattered by the additional indirect taxation that has now been levied by means of the artificial appreciation of the rupee, against which the whole country has protested. While millions have to pay dearly for a pinch of salt, a handful of fat people are still allowed to draw exchange compensation on the principle, it is presumed, that 'to him that hath shall be given'. The evil effect of the artificially managed currency on the producers were fully pointed out by me on this platform at the time and even before the closure of the Mints. I had forecasted the evils which have been now realised. Those engaged in industrial pursuits, chiefly tea and cotton, have not been slow to point out how the evil effects have told tangibly on their earnings. Their spokesmen and recognised organisations have publicly drawn attention to the injury entailed on them. In the Bombay Presidency, the wail is that Japan has benefited by the closure of the Mints. The *yen* has still a better purchasing value than the Chinese dollar. Hence, Japan is better able to compete with, if not undersell, Bombay yarn in the common markets of China. The tea-planters of Calcutta and Assam, too, have similarly complained. Their grievance is, that the artificial rupee gives a poorer return for their sales in gold-using countries, and that this poorer yield is in no way compen-

sated for by cheaper cost of production. An intelligent controversy is still going on in the Press, specially in the *Capital*. In Bombay, Mr. J. A. Wadia, a shrewd mill owner, has been inditing a series of letters on the subject. Again, we have the outside independent testimony of Mr. Kopsch, late Commissioner and Statistical Secretary of Imperial Chinese Maritime Customs, as related in the pages of the *Empire Review*. He observes there that :

The marked falling off in Indian textile fabrics suggests a rise in price owing to the fictitious value of the rupee, and consequent decline in demand, whereas the Japanese exchange still remains about *par*.

Again, speaking of the falling off of British export trade generally with the Far East, Mr. Kopsch remarks that the

real explanation appears to be that the enhanced silver price of our goods, due to the demonetisation of the white metal, completely nullifies every advantage acquired by extended and free markets, as one example will show. Our shipments to China in 1890 when exchange averaged 5s. 2½d. aggregated £9,138,000, and ten years later (1899) when the rate only yielded 3½s, our exports for the year remained the same, say £9,038,000, though possibly larger in bulk, notwithstanding that we have now a vastly greater field to supply. But if we convert these sterling shipments to Chinese currency, it will be found that merchandise of the same sterling value which cost 35,232,497 *taels* in 1890 now requires a payment of 60,046,186 *taels*, or an increase of 70 per cent.—an impost calculated to stunt any possible growth.

These remarks are worthy of serious consideration. Mr. David Yule, of your city, has in more than one speech of his as Chairman of the Calcutta Bank, referred to this evil effect of the artificially inflated rupee. The opinion of so sound and level headed a critic of the Government policy of currency demands consideration and is entitled to respect. But while this is the complaint of those who lay the principal cause of the depression of the tea and cotton industry principally at the door of recent currency legislation, I am not unaware of the arguments on the other side, namely, by those who refuse to accept that proposition. It is urged that much of the depression, of which both tea-planters and cotton manufacturers

complain, has its origin in over-production and other causes. As far as the former are concerned, a statement prepared by Mr. George Seton, touching 45 tea companies and their price has been published to demonstrate what little foundation there is for attributing the depression in the trade to the artificial rupee. To me it seems that both causes have combined to bring it about. I cannot bring myself to the belief that the altered currency has rendered no injury whatever. The injury has been done though possibly not to the exaggerated extent alleged by the complainants. In the case of the Bombay cotton mills, it may be worth while inquiring, how much of the depression is owing to over-production, how much to improvident management, how much to heavy interest on a debt beyond the original capital outlay and how much to short time consequent on plague and famine. A careful survey of the earnings of Bombay cotton industry will show that the average profits do not go beyond 5 per cent. and a greater portion of the earnings of weaving mills is swept away by the excise duty brought into force by the currency nostrum. In the case of the planters, too, it may be enquired how much may be due to the currency nostrum, how much to the condition of the tea soils themselves, as Mr. Horace Mann observes, and how much to over-production. It will be thus seen, that the subject is an arguable one from both sides. That the producers and manufacturers have been hit cannot be gainsaid. The former, the bulk of whom are our impoverished agriculturists, are now paying a larger amount to the State treasury by way of their land-revenue in the shape of indirect taxation. For every rupee now paid into the Treasury by the ryot represents at least 30 per cent. more of the produce of his land. All other taxes are similarly raised; so, too, all debts. Practically there is a sweeping transfer of property from the working millions who create the wealth and make the prosperity of the empire to the tax-eaters. But, on the other hand, it is observed that the producer in turn is benefitted in his purchasing power by the same enhanced rupee. The question is where lies the greater advantage.

—on the side of the State or the producer ? Again, what about the silver ornaments of the masses ? What are their losses to-day when silver is sold for Rs. 67 instead of 100 rupees per 100 tolas ? These are questions which have to be duly weighed. As I have just remarked, the matter is perfectly arguable and could be well threshed out by a Committee of really competent and interested experts. Meanwhile, it may be noted that the coinage of over 14 crores of new rupees last year for British India has completely exploded the fallacy of a former Finance Minister as to the “redundancy” of that coin. The stringency of the monetary market, from the date of the closure of the Mints till late, clearly demonstrated, apart from the factor of famine expenditure, that the redundancy argument was a romance of our currency doctrinaires. The rupee is indispensable to millions of the population, and it is impossible that it can be driven out from the ordinary transactions of business-people and the domestic economy of the masses, and so long as the huge amount of the coin in circulation remains unabsorbed by our new-fangled currency, the policy of the Government can hardly be pronounced a success. With an increasing population, an increasing number of rupees will have still to be added to the existing circulation. What has happened in the case of Germany as regards *thalers*, after the demonetisation of silver in 1873, is actually happening in India with regard to rupees. For fully 26 years the German Government did its level best by all kinds of makeshifts to drive away the *thalers* from circulation and substitute gold, but was repeatedly foiled. At last that Government has had to increase rather than diminish the coinage of *thalers*, owing principally to the fact that people could not do without them and the demand per head of the population had greatly increased. Whether the demand in future in India will be larger per head may be questioned. It depends on the greater material prosperity of the people. But the growth of the population itself must oblige the Indian Government to coin at the very least at the rate of 4 crores per annum. Had they continued to coin at that rate during the last seven years, there should

have been an additional circulation of 28 to 30 crores. But the panic-stricken short-sightedness, which closed the Mints, could not see its way to this coinage. Meanwhile, stringency during the busy season became chronic, till the different Chambers of Commerce eventually compelled the Government to coin afresh. The fact conclusively demonstrated the fallacy of redundancy, and established the necessity of an annual coinage in proportion to the popular demand. We have already about 17 crores of additional circulation which has had the effect of allaying the stringency. But these facts inform us how far the State is behind in matters of finance and currency, and how its ignorance and stubbornness entail incalculable injury on all classes of the community, save the tax-eaters.

MILITARY EXPENDITURE

Reverting to finances again, it is a matter of regret that Military expenditure, against which the Congress, from the very date of its inception, has vigorously entered its protest, and against which your representative as the Chairman of the British Committee made a strong fight before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, has undergone no diminution. I pointed out in my evidence before that body that but for the increased Military expenditure which has steadily grown since the seizure of Upper Burma and the Penjdeh scare, there might have arisen no necessity for additional taxation; and that the pretext of low exchange was utterly unfounded. The increased burden of exchange by reason of the fall in the value of silver, at which the Government was needlessly alarmed, could have been easily borne without a pie of additional taxation. The expenditure of 25 crores per annum against the former one of 16 has only been made practicable by this taxation. The question is whether there is any necessity for the large increase in the Army which has been witnessed since 1886. The Government of India itself has been of opinion that it is not, and that India is made to maintain so large an Army for British Imperial interests. In the latest Despatch which was

submitted by that authority itself to the Royal Commission, it is observed :—

(Para. 21 of Government of India Despatch of 25 March 1890, Appendix 45, Vol. II, Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure.) :—Millions of money have been spent on increasing the Army in India, on armaments and fortifications, to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of the warlike people of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East. The scope of all these great and costly measures reaches far beyond Indian limits and the policy which dictates them is an Imperial policy. We claim, therefore, that in the maintenance of the British forces in this country a just and even liberal view should be taken of the charges which should legitimately be made against Indian revenue. The people of India, who have no voice in the matter, should not be able to complain that an excessive Military tribute is demanded from the revenue of this country, while on her side, England, with whom rests the final decision, should be able to show that this settlement has been effected in a spirit of justice and consideration.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MINORITY OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE

It is clear from the above extract that it is owing to the maintenance of British supremacy in the East that this Army is maintained. Equity, therefore, demands that the British Treasury should bear all the expenses. What we have to incessantly urge on the Government and Parliament is the injustice of making India pay the piper while the British nation calls for the tune. No doubt some relief has been given to Indian finances by carrying out the recommendations of the majority of the Royal Commission in reference to capitation grants. But we should never lose sight of the fact that the majority's recommendations under this head are of a flea-bite character and that they have ignored the larger question of the equitable apportionment of all Military charges. We have to look, therefore, to the recommendations of the minority, who have made their report from the Indian point of view. The principle propounded is a very reasonable one and ought to commend itself to those who are anxious to see that there should be absolute financial equity in the matter of all England's relations

with India. Since British Imperial requirements and British supervision are urged as absolutely essential, it is but fair that Great Britain should share equally with India all expenses of British agency, Civil and Military. As the minority report recommends: "The cost of all European agency, wherever employed, might be divided half-and-half between India and the Imperial Exchequer." The British taxpayer would thus, equally with the Indian taxpayer, become interested in checking the excessive employment of costly imported agency and a useful spirit of inquiry would be aroused with reference to efficiency and economy of the Indian administration. The salary of the Secretary of State himself would thus come under purview, which would at least have this effect; that all inflated optimism, which he often aired at Budget debates and elsewhere in matters of Indian finance, would find no place in that functionary's recitation. On such a broad and equitable principle it is practicable, without even withdrawing a single European soldier, who, it is alleged, is needed for Imperial purposes in which England alone is interested, to agree to the recommendation of the minority that

the revenues of India should be relieved of their entire charges, and that they should be treated as part of the reserve forces of the Eastern portion of the British Empire generally, and borne in future upon the Army Estimates in that capacity.

It should be remembered that since 1885-86, the Military expenditure has shown a growth of nearly 33 per cent. In other words, it may be said that the Army expenditure absorbs the whole land-revenue of the Empire. It is the principal obstacle in the way of all other domestic reforms of vital importance to the welfare of the masses. The separation of Judicial from Executive functions hangs fire, though Mr. Stephen Jacob observed that the increased expenditure on this account will only cost half-a crore per annum. Similarly with the crying reform in the administration of the Police, on which there is a universality of opinion. Again, there is the necessity of a liberal expenditure on education, on which the different Provincial Governments spend just one crore of

rupees, which, to say the least, is miserable compared with the immense sums spent in Europe and America. To us all it is a matter of profound regret that the State expenditure on education is hardly commensurate with the reputation of the British for enlightened liberality.

ECONOMY OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURE

But, Gentlemen, it is not necessary for me to say that expenditure depends on policy, and so long as policy in this country is erroneous and calculated to promote Indian interests only in a secondary degree, it is not expected that we could have a chance of reduction in the expenditure. Economy and efficiency are nowhere, though we, no doubt, hear of the Government constantly saying that economy is practised to a remarkable degree. It has to be remembered that this assertion emanates from the tax-eaters, who are aliens and masters of the situation.

Indians have no voice in the expenditure and taxation of the country. Otherwise they may show how, with a minimum of taxation, the maximum of economy and efficiency may be established. But there is the overweening conceit of the governing classes that we are an inferior race and hardly capable of carrying on the government, much less of steering State finance. Monopolists as they are, it is natural that they should view all Indian matters from their own selfish point of view. Hence they think that all monopoly of State wisdom and State finance is concentrated in them alone; and that we are no better than mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. In this connection, however, it may be most instructive at this juncture to quote from that famous letter which Turgot addressed to Louis XVI on 24th August, 1774 :

The question, Sir, will be asked incredulously 'on what can we retrench?' and each one speaking for his own department will maintain that nearly every particular item of expense is indispensable. They will be able to allege very good reasons, but these must all yield to the absolute necessity of economy. . . . Your Majesty is aware that one of the greatest obstacles to economy is the multitude of demands by which you are constantly besieged. It is necessary, Sir, to consider whence comes to you

this money which you are able to distribute among your courtiers, and to compare the misery of those from whom it has to be extracted (sometimes by the most rigorous methods) with the situation of the class of persons who push their claims on your liberality. . . . It may reasonably be hoped, by the improvement of cultivation, by the suppression of abuses in the collection of the taxes, and by their more equitable assessment, that a substantial relief of the people can be attained without diminishing greatly the public revenue, but without economy being the first step all reforms are impossible. So long as finance shall be continually subject to the old expedients in order to provide for State Services, your Majesty will always be dependent upon financiers, and they will ever be the *masters* and by the manœuvres belonging to their office they will frustrate the most important operations. . . . When you have recognised the justice and necessity of these principles, I implore you to maintain with firmness their execution, without allowing yourself to be dismayed by the clamours which are absolutely certain to arise on such matters whatever system we adopt, whatever line of conduct we pursue.

It is to be hoped that those in the highest authority will bear constantly in mind these wise sayings of Turgot, between every line of which much has to be significantly read. Indian finance would then certainly undergo a vast change for the better. At present, it is neither here nor there. We are not even fortunate in having trained financiers with true grasp of the first principles of public finance at the head of our finances. But it would be well if those in power and responsibility not only bore in mind Turgot's memorable counsel to his King, but the sage declaration of the far-sighted and practical Sir Robert Peel on the same question. Speaking of Indian finance, he observed that it is "a superficial view of the relations of England with India", that there is no direct immediate connection between the finances of India and those of England.

"Depend upon it," observed that thoughtful Chancellor of the Exchequer, "if the credit of India should become disordered, if some great exertion should become necessary, then the credit of England must be brought forwards to its support, and the collateral and the indirect effect of disorders in Indian finances would be felt extensively in this country."

I presume that not until such a financial catastrophe occurs that the responsible authorities in England

and India will ever learn to practise economy in State expenditure.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

This address would be incomplete without mention of another cognate topic, namely, the industrial development of the country. The subject is vast and demands not only a paper but a ponderous volume by itself. I can even hardly touch the fringe of this great problem, on the solution of which many a person and Government itself have been intent for some time past. How to revive old industries, already extinct or on the verge of extinction, and to foster new ones—these are the two questions. The revival of the former may be most problematical for the simple reason that steam and electricity have entirely revolutionised arts and industries of the old-fashioned type, which almost wholly depended on manual labour. The arts and industries of India, which flourished and prospered so well prior to the period which wrought the industrial evolution of Europe, and especially of the United Kingdom, where all attended to by manual labour, especially the finer class of cotton fabrics. So long as this country was on a par with Europe previous to the age of steam and mechanical science, it was no doubt able to hold its own. But it so happened that with the introduction of those two elements in the economy of the older Continent of the West, there was simultaneously wrought a change in India's political destinies. There was a change of rulers, who first came as traders, but stayed to remain as masters. The instinct of the shopkeeper was, of course, predominant; so, too, was that of self-interest, which, as moral philosophers say, is the motive of all action in the domestic economy of human affairs. Those instincts had a powerful influence on the industrial situation as it existed, say a century ago. With the aid of steam they were able to manufacture and import goods slowly, of course, at first, which could be undersold in competition with the hand-work of the Indian skilled artisan. Self-interest and supreme power combined, however, to accelerate the process, which ultimately had the economic effect of diminishing to a vast extent the

indigenous manufactures. The early traders, who were also politicians and masters of the situation, killed the industries by means of tariffs at both extremes. Heavy import duties were levied in the United Kingdom, thanks to the influence of the East India Company with the British Government of the day, on many goods and manufactures of India. There is ample evidence of the fact in the numerous petitions which Indians and non-official Englishmen, who were allowed to trade in the country, presented from time to time to Parliament and the King. These may be read in the voluminous reports of the several East India Parliamentary Committees which sat between 1813 and 1853. On the other hand, comparatively light duty was imposed on cotton manufactures and other articles imported into India. Thus, it was that year after year, as steam helped new inventions, and successfully applied science to practical use, Indian manual industries, which once flourished and brought home profits from foreign parts, languished till at last most of them became extinct. This is the net economic result to India of a century of the progress of Science in the West. Whether India would have worked out its own industrial salvation in obedience to Science, had it been left to be governed by its own native rulers, is a speculation on which it is not necessary to enter. Suffice to say that those who could not prosper by their handicraft, were necessarily driven to agriculture. Railways partially drove many more, who plied their trade as carriers, to the same industry. Thus it is that India is now almost an agricultural country. The hand of the dial was set back for a century. But a century of British Rule and a century of Practical Science have wrought new ideals, one of which is the industrial regeneration of the country, without which it is impossible that wealth may be stimulated in a greater degree. It is universally admitted that if the disheartening phenomena now to be seen are at all to undergo a change for the better; if, in short, prosperity is to be induced among the vast masses of the population, the only solution is the development of industries and manufactures.

How is that object to be achieved? The more we think on the subject, the more we are driven to the conclusion that capital is the first essential. And where may capital be? Imagine, Gentlemen, for a moment the following situation: Suppose that the English withdraw from the country bag and baggage, that is to say, that they withdraw all their capital and retire. What may be the condition of the trade and the people? And what may be the amount of capital left in the country? If, as I have already stated, there have been in operation for years past economic laws which are opposed to Nature, the net effect of which is the drain of the surplus national wealth, which ought to be laid out for greater progress in this country in industries and manufactures, to foreign parts, without any hope of return, is it possible that under the hypothetical event I have asked you to consider, there could be anything left by way of capital to work out our industrial regeneration? Thus what India is suffering from is want of capital, which at present is nowhere. What little there is, is undoubtedly of much use and is greatly prized. We feel all the better for it. Otherwise it is certain that the country would have been in a worse plight. As a proof of the extreme paucity of capital, you have only to refer to the "financial and commercial statistics of British India" and the combined amount invested in cotton and jute mills and other industrial concerns, including tea-plantation and coal mines. Deduct therefrom the sum of foreign capital and compare the residue with the capital of the rest of the commercial countries of the world. You will then have some definite notion of the immeasurable depth of India's poverty. And since economists tell us that industry is limited by capital, I have to ask you further whether any very serious hopes can be entertained of industrial regeneration, as you all earnestly wish, so long as this is the condition of affairs, want of adequate capital? It has of late been pointed out how Japan fares and how the Japanese have displayed remarkable industrial development. True. None can gainsay the fact. But it should be remembered that both China and Japan are independent nations, and

that there is not that exhausting process going on in those two countries, of the annual abstraction of the national surplus of wealth to the extent of 30 to 40 crores as has been the fact in India for half a century and over. You may send the most intellectual and practical of your countrymen to instruct themselves in the mechanical arts, industries and manufactures of Europe, America and Japan; but of what avail will their knowledge and exercise be if, on their arrival, private capital and private enterprise be not forthcoming or will not help them? As a matter of fact, I am one of those who think that the chill penury of the land has to a certain extent repressed even the mental faculty, though, no doubt, we have occasionally such trained men as Mr. Bose and others. It freezes the currents which ought to flow. The mournful truth must be acknowledged that slow rises the country which is depressed by poverty which has for its root political causes.

But having said so much, we should not despair. Be the causes of India's economic condition what they may, we are bound to put our shoulders to the wheel. It would not do to cry over the past. It is more manful to tuck up our sleeves, gird up our loins and work like heroes to regenerate our country by arts and industries, and raise it once more to a zenith of prosperity. There are undoubtedly formidable lions in our path, the foreign exploiters and the monopolists in place and power; but we need not be deterred by them. We cannot allow ourselves to lie in the Slough of Despondency or take up a permanent residence in the Castle of Giant Despair. We have under existing conditions a double duty to discharge. Firstly, by our legitimate and reasonable agitation of a persistent character, to alter the economic policy of the Government, which has proved so fatal to our prosperity hitherto, and, secondly, to work out by all means in our power, to the last atom of our physical and mental energy, our own economic salvation. Increased means and increased leisure are the two prime levers necessary to achieve the object. But it is essential at first to have distinct and clear ideas on the subject. A variety of

loose talk has been going forward for some time past, and technical education is suggested or recommended as a panacea for industrial revival. But it is disappointing to get no satisfactory answer from those who talk of that education when we ask them to practically propound what they mean. For instance, when we ask them how even 6 per cent. of the agricultural population, say a crore, may be diverted to industrial occupation there is no rational reply. Hence I entreat you all, Gentlemen, not to be carried away by the parrot cry of the reformer, be he Parliamentary or any other, who talks superficially of technical education without pointing out the practical means whereby even 6 per cent. of the masses can be weaned from agricultural pursuits. The question of technical education so glibly talked now is nothing new. It was originally mooted some twenty years since, and one of the very first to draw up an elaborate and practical paper was Mr. Dadabhoy Naoroji himself. It was as early as 1885 that he wrote that paper and submitted it to Lord Reay. The late Mr. Justice Telang had also said a great deal on the subject. But, Gentlemen, do not be carried away by the catch-phrase. Technical education, which shall result in large and profitable industrial development, signifies higher education, specially of Sciences. What has made Germany, which was poor a quarter of a century ago, so advanced, above all other countries on the Continent and brought it in the front rank of industrial and manufacturing nations? Why is it now surpassing England? The answer is, that Germany has paid the greatest attention to the mechanical sciences. The country is a network of laboratories. Are you prepared to have Technical schools of the highest grade as they have in Germany? Why those who talk tall about technical education are the very persons who decry higher education? It is idle to talk of mere small industries in carpentry and brick-making and so forth. If there is to be an industrial revival of a practical character which shall change the entire surface of this country, you will have first to lay the foundation of teaching in the Applied Sciences. You cannot have the cart before the

horse. Higher education must precede industrial development. But let alone higher education. Where is even mass education in the humbler sort of industries? When not even 5 per cent. of the population is literate, do you expect that there can be any industrial development without education, even assuming that capital be forthcoming? The subject is not so simple as is lightly imagined. It is most difficult, and the best way of apprehending the difficulties is to ascertain the views of those who are most capable of advising on it. Many a vague idea is now floating in the air which requires to be definitely formulated, and many crude and ill-digested recommendations need to be put into the crucible of the practical, with a view to bring, thoroughly tested before we can all agree, upon a common basis on which a fair attempt at industrial development might be made. Let me request you also to remember the sage counsel of Mr. Morley :

That the interest of human progress is bound up with man's willingness to strive after ideals which seem to be attainable. The mere fact of striving exalts the character, disciplines and develops the faculties, and by gradual and almost imperceptible degrees approaches always more nearly to the goal.

First and foremost, then, let us be so far prepared by a close study and consideration of the question as to be able to equip themselves with the ideals we wish for. That is the fundamental essential.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

And now, Gentlemen, I must bring this address, already lengthened out beyond what I wished and expected, to a close. You will pardon me if I have taxed your patience overmuch, and you will pardon me still more if I have left out of my purview many other important topics on which the Congress has been incessantly attracting the attention of the Ruler, such as the separation of Judicial from Executive functions, the reform of the Police, of Excise and Forest laws, the question of Juries, the further modification of the constitution of our Legislative Councils, which are still a splemn mockery, higher education, provincial finance and other equally important

matters. But with a Session limited to three days and with the orthodox hour and-a-half for a Presidential Address, it is not practical to do justice even to a tithe of the topics enumerated in the way they ought to be, despite all efforts at condensation. But I trust I have this time endeavoured, in pursuance of the general voice of our enlightened countrymen, to rivet your attention on such topics alone as are of absorbing interest at present. They are topics on which the attention of the Government is greatly concentrated. And if any Viceroy could listen to our prayers on those special subjects with the respect and attention that they deserve, I am sure you will agree with me that that Viceroy is Lord Curzon, whose zeal for the advancement of the general welfare of our people is beyond all praise and whose uniform sympathy and burning desire to hold the scales even and render us all that justice on more than one matter, which is our due and for which we have been knocking at the door of Government these many years, are unquestionable. May it be the good fortune of his Lordship to render this country lasting good before he lays down his exalted office, and earn the gratitude of its people. The course of a wise and just Government in this matter is straight, be the opposition what it may. The Government has neither to look to the right nor to the left. It has one goal straight before it to reach. It has to discharge its duty by the people, how to promote their contentment and prosperity. I would repeat here what I stated in my Presidential Address at the Belgaum Provincial Conference. It is needful, nay imperative, in order to stimulate the Government to action, to have the motive power of well-informed and disinterested public opinion. This can only be created by arousing the British people, through the influence and instrumentality of Englishmen, sympathising with our aspiration as the British Congress Committee has been strenuously doing these few years with an energy, capacity, and self-sacrifice which are beyond all praise. It is needful to strengthen the hands of that Committee, extend its operations and enlarge the scope of its undoubted utility in this direction. For such a purpose heavy sacrifices will

have to be made. For, it would be absurd to attempt to achieve such an object without any sacrifice at all. Hence I repeat, we shall never be able to bring the reforms we ask for within the range of practical politics till the English are sufficiently and correctly educated as regards our demands. We are at present in a transition state. We are passing from the old order of things to the new. But the process of transition, as history teaches us, is invariably beset with obstacles. Thus it is that the broad and liberal statesmanship, which characterised British Rule in India till late, has been somewhat arrested. "Insane Imperialism," to use Mr. Morley's phrase, with its mischievous policy of retrogression and repression, is in the ascendant for the moment. But this policy of political insanity, I am firmly of conviction, must sooner or later give way to the former policy of sound liberalism, modified in conformity with the march of time and the irresistible logic of events. The policy should be constructive, having for its foundation the material and moral improvement of the masses. All else is doomed to failure. Indians have never been slow to recognise the benefits of British Rule. But it would be unreasonable to ask them to sing eternally its praises and transform themselves into its unqualified panegyrists. No doubt we have a good Government, but it is not unmixed with many an evil. The desire is that the evil may be purged away, and that in the course of time, we may have a better Government. So far we are not asking for the impossible. The impossible will be asked only when, as Mr. Lowell says, the reasonable and the practicable is denied. For, it is only when the possible is made difficult that people fancy the impossible to be easy. I repeat, Gentlemen, that the liberal statesmanship of the nineteenth century has infused a new life into us. It has made the national pulse throb quicker. It has raised aspirations which can never be allayed till they are reasonably satisfied. I have enough faith in the virtue of time and in the stern sense of British justice. Patiently we should await the fruition of those efforts which the national party all over the country have been putting forth these many years.

Time, as the poet says, is the artificer of all nations. It is only when our demands are fairly fulfilled that the existing dissatisfaction generally prevailing will cease. Then alone will contentment, on the foundation of which alone rests the permanence of British Rule, prevail. There is a Providence watching the destinies of this hapless and helpless country. May that Providence inspire its rulers with wisdom, justice and sympathy to add another but brighter and purer page to the history of India. In the burning words of the eloquent Macaulay, let it record in the maturity of time that the British found a nation sunk in the lowest depth of degradation, ignorance and superstition, and raised it to the highest pinnacle of freedom and civilisation which it was in their power to confer.
(Prolonged cheers.)

MR. SURENDRANATH BANERJEE.

INTRODUCTION

I thank you with all my heart for the great honour which you have done me by electing me as President of this Congress. An honour, such as this, is all the more gratifying to the recipient when he is reminded of the tenure by which he holds it, *viz.*, the love, the esteem, the confidence of his fellow-countrymen. For us Indians the highest earthly honours, no matter by whom conferred, pale before a distinction which bears upon it the stamp of the approbation and the unstinted confidence of united India. Whether I deserve the honour or not, this I will say that the sanction by which I hold it is the highest, much higher than most sanctions by which authority is exercised here or elsewhere, *viz.*, the choice of my fellow-countrymen. Here, if anywhere, there is the right divine for the exercise of authority.

This is the second time that you have summoned me to this great office. When I received your mandate, I obeyed it, but not without hesitation. For however partial I might be to my own merits—and who is not—I could not shut my eyes to the fact that there were many distinguished men who, by their great public services and by their still nobler self-abnegation in the national cause, had fully established their claims to the honour of the Presidential Office. But the choice lay not with me. An expression of your wishes, firmly and authoritatively conveyed to me by those who are entitled to speak in your name and on your behalf, is and has always been to me a command. I overcame my scruples. I bowed to the

national will. I appealed to the sympathies of my friends and I invoked the blessing of Almighty Providence to sanctify our work. And here I am to-day, ready to co-operate with you to bring to a successful issue the labours of the Eighteenth National Congress.

This is the first time that the Congress is held at Ahmedabad. We knew your difficulties, and we admire the dauntless courage with which you faced them and the noble persistency with which you overcame them. Guzarat is but slowly emerging from the throes of one of the greatest calamities of the century. Since 1899, it was in the grip of a famine which, to use the words of the Viceroy, "has been the severest that India has ever known". The story is one of the darkest in Indian History, relieved only by the noble patience and fortitude of the sufferers and the strenuous efforts of the British Government to alleviate their distress. Your difficulties were realized by us, and now that you have overcome them and have held this Session of the Congress which bids fair to be one of the most successful, we applaud the public spirit which has been triumphant over obstacles so formidable, and we hasten to offer you the felicitations of all India.

When the Congress was last invited to the Bombay Presidency, it was held at Poona. The capital of the Deccan, Poona, is the intellectual centre of the Western Presidency. It is the focus and the starting point of those forces which have shaped the aspirations and have determined the intellectual and political life of this Presidency. No longer the capital of the Peshwas, it aspires to a higher dominion—it seeks to assert its empire over the hearts and convictions of men. Along with this sovereignty is associated an honoured name, held in universal esteem throughout the length and breadth of this wide, wide Continent. Who can speak of Poona's greatest son, whose loss we all deplore, whose memory we cherish with a pious and reverential affection? The foremost man of his generation, next to Ram Mohan Roy, the mightiest product of English education, the life, character and achievements

of Mahadev Govind Ranade constitute a national heritage, and if it be true, as indeed it is, that great men never die, he lives with us and amongst us with an immortality which is co-extensive with the life of the race—the inspirer of our noble achievements, our comforter amid distress, he speaks trumpet-tongued from amid the death-like silence of nothingness.

THE AHMEDABAD CONGRESS : ITS SPECIAL FEATURES

The last Congress in the Bombay Presidency was held at Poona, a great intellectual centre. The Congress of this year is held at Ahmedabad, a great industrial centre. Having regard to the recent expansion of our programme (I will not call it a departure), and to the inter-linking in our minds of the industrial and the political movements, it seems to me that there is a special appropriateness in holding the present Session of the Congress at Ahmedabad. It is an open declaration that we, the men of the Congress, regard the industrial and the political movements as indissolubly linked together—we hold that they are interdependent and that they act and react upon each other, and by their mutual interaction swell the volume of both. If we cannot claim to be the originators of the industrial movement, this, at any rate, may fairly be laid to our credit that we have stimulated those forces and deepened those impulses which have brought it about. When the human mind is roused in one particular direction, the impulse is felt along the entire sphere of human activities. The industrial movement was bound to follow in the wake of the political movement. The industrial precedes or follows the political movement. In England, it preceded it. The Reform Bill of 1832 was the outcome of the enormous expansion of the manufacturing industries which was witnessed during the close of the 18th century. In India, the order has been different, that here again the intimate relationship between the two movements is illustrated, and the political movement preceding the industrial, we claim that we have communicated the Promethean spark which has vitalized the dying embers of Indian national life in all its spheres ; we claim that we

have fanned them forth into a living flame, full of warmth and brightness and radiance.

The industrial movement is flowing deep, fraught with national ideals. It partakes of the character of the parent movement. It follows in its footsteps with a truly filial piety. A widespread feeling has been roused in favour of the growth and expansion of indigenous arts and industries, and the distinguished men who organized the Industrial Exhibition in connection with the Calcutta Congress of last year have still further carried their high endeavours by opening a storehouse for Indian goods. Our infant industries need protection. But the Government, wedded to the traditions of free-trade, will not grant them protection. If, however, protection by legislative enactment is impossible, may we not, by the fiat of the national will, afford them such protection as may lie in our power, if we resolve in our heart of hearts to avail ourselves, wherever practicable, of indigenous articles in preference to foreign goods. Has not the time come, when the scattered national impulses may be focussed into an organic and organised whole, for a supreme effort for the promotion of our industries? May we not obtain a complete and comprehensive list of Indian articles available for our varied requirements and seek to encourage their manufacture and stimulate their expansion? I quite agree that the process is expensive. But it is of the essence of protection to incur present pecuniary sacrifice in view of future gain; and our national industries, placed on a sound and satisfactory footing, under a moral protection, evoked by a lofty spirit of patriotism, will, in their own good time, bring in an abundant harvest of gold. All sacrifice, incurred for high national purposes and towards the attainment of great national ideals, is repaid with compound interest. Such is the ordering of nature, the dispensation of Divine Providence; and the sacrifices we now make to restore our lost industries and to establish new ones will compensate us a hundredfold by enabling us to supply our own wants and to check in part at least that depletion of the national wealth which more than anything else has

contributed to the appalling poverty of our people. Our industrial helplessness is even more deplorable than our political impotency. And if the Congress can do aught to stimulate the forces which would improve our industrial condition, it would add one more to the many titles which it already possesses to the enduring gratitude of the people of India. Nay more, it would render a great service to the Government. It would relieve the Government, in part at least, of those serious administrative difficulties which have their roots in the deplorably straitened conditions of Indian life. It is therefore with all thankfulness I note that the Industrial Exhibition has come to be regarded as a necessary adjunct to the National Congress. Your Exhibition has been a magnificent success. It has been opened under distinguished auspices by a Prince, whose enlightenment and culture, whose broad and statesmanlike view and deep sympathy with all high endeavours for the public good have not only placed him in the forefront among the Sovereign Princes of India, but have won for him the unstinted homage and admiration of the educated community of India who are proud to reckon him as one of themselves. It must be the heartfelt hope and prayer of every well-wisher of his country, that the Industrial Exhibition, which was opened by His Highness the Maharaja of Baroda, may still further stimulate the industries of this great town and that this Session of the Congress may for ever be associated in the minds of the people of Guzarat with a new epoch of industrial development, tempered by deep and rational political convictions, prompted by unswerving loyalty to the British connection. Let it never be forgotten that political rights minister to material progress and that an unenfranchised people can never work out their industrial salvation.

THE DELHI DURBAR

The one feeling which is predominant in the breast of every true Congressman, which shapes and colours his political conviction and might be said to constitute the key-note of his political creed, is love and reverence for

his Sovereign and his country. He loves his Sovereign, because he loves his country, and because his Sovereign is the Head of the State and is the embodiment of those constitutional principles which it is his aim and endeavour and the aspiration of his life to introduce into the government of his own country and which, when recognized as principles of Indian administration, he firmly believes will conduce to the prosperity of his native land and the permanence of British rule in India. Inspired by this feeling of love and reverence for the Head of the British Constitution, our august Sovereign, we heard of His Majesty's illness with profound sorrow—we watched the progress of the disease with the utmost anxiety—and we rejoiced beyond measure on His Majesty's recovery, and from our temples and our mosques and our churches there went forth one great chorus of thanksgiving to the Great Giver of all Good, for His abounding mercy in sparing to us our Sovereign, the embodiment of all our hopes and with whose reign are identified the fulfilment of our most cherished aspirations and the redemption of the solemn promises contained in the Queen's Proclamation. The Coronation postponed by His Majesty's illness took place in August last. It was an event of Imperial, of world-wide significance. The eyes of the civilized world were fixed upon it as upon an event which proclaimed to the nations of the earth the formal assumption of regal authority by the Sovereign of an Empire whose watchword is freedom and which has extended to the remotest corners of the world the blessings of constitutional liberty. To the people of India, the Coronation was an event of unique importance. For the first time in the history of our relations with Britain, a King of England was crowned Emperor of Hindustan. For the first time in the history of our relations with Britain, Indian representatives were present at the Coronation of an English King, though, if the truth is to be told, it must be said that the representation of the educated community was most inadequate. It is proposed to celebrate the Coronation by a great Durbar to be held at Delhi in the course of the next few days. The Durbar has been the subject of animated

controversy both here and in England. It has been fiercely assailed by critics whose utterances are entitled to respectful attention. One of them has described it as "an act of uncalled for extravagance", specially out of place at a time when the country is just emerging from the throes of a great famine, when despite the grateful rains which have done so much to improve the situation, there is still a large number of people who are in receipt of famine-relief and when it is proposed to saddle the Indian revenues with the charge of nearly a million sterling to meet the cost of the efficiency of the reformed British Army in India. Of course, there are others who have come forward to defend the Durbar. The *Times* has lent to it its thunderous support and has recorded a vigorous protest against the protestors. His Excellency the Viceroy has himself entered the arena, and in a speech conceived in his best style has defended the Durbar and the policy which it embodies. His Excellency has given us the assurance that the cost of the ceremonial "will be immeasurably less than the dimensions which a too tropical imagination has allowed it to assume and that a great State ceremonial will never have been conducted in India upon more economical lines". I am not here concerned to defend the possessors of "a too tropical imagination" among whom, be it observed, are several Anglo-Indian journalists of note, one of whom at least has not lived in the tropics for many a long year. They are well able to defend themselves and have done so. Despite their protests, the Durbar will soon be an accomplished fact, and I do not know that it will serve any useful purpose to refer at length to a controversy which has not altered the course of event and now possesses more or less an academic interest. It is fast receding into the past and will soon vanish out of the domain of contemporary politics. But the Rulers of India may learn a lesson and may take a warning from the statesmanship of the past. History has condemned with unequivocal emphasis the Delhi Durbar of 1877 as an expensive pageant of doubtful utility. The time has passed by when a mere pageant, calculated to dazzle and to astonish, can leave an enduring

impression upon the public mind of India. Thanks to the educational efforts of our Rulers, to the wise, the sagacious and the beneficent policy which they have followed, we have long since passed the stage of childhood and have entered upon a period of vigorous adolescence when we are able to discriminate the substance from the shadow. Let no one lay the flattering unction to his soul that the educational movement which has brought about this result is confined to a microscopic minority. The movement is becoming wider and deeper day by day, and while we are foolishly talking of a microscopic minority, the social forces, noiselessly but steadily working in the bosom of society, are developing results which promise to bring the entire community, the classes as well as the masses, within those educational influences which have leavened the upper ranks of the social system. The ideas of the educated few, says John Stuart Mill, are bound to filter downwards and become, in the course of time, the ideas of the uneducated many. The process is in vigorous operation in India and let the rulers of the land take note of the fact. A mere pageant will not satisfy public opinion. It will emphasize the complaints that have been made. It is, indeed, an acceptable feature of the Durbar that there is to be an Industrial Exhibition in connection with it where the products of indigenous arts and industries will be displayed. We are grateful to His Excellency for his interest in the development of our national arts and industries, and we may be permitted to express the hope that it may lead to abiding results. But that is not enough. The Durbar needs to be consecrated by the touch of a higher statesmanship. If it is to be a great historic event, as it is intended to be, it should form a landmark in our annals—it should be commemorated by some boon which would remind us and our children for all time to come of the occasion and of the principal actors therein. The pomp and glitter of the show, the fine dresses and equipages, even the Oriental magnificence of the scene, set off to the best advantage by the choicest rhetoric which the resources of the English language can supply, will not avail to rescue the Durbar from the corroding influence of time and

oblivion. These things will be swept out of view amid the onward rush of events. They will be forgotten; the historic recollection will retain no trace of them; but the popular concession which enlarges the sphere of a people's rights and enhances their self-respect, or which exalts the purity of the system under which justice is administered and improves its quality, or which once again commemorates the grand old precept that righteousness exalteth a nation, will constitute an enduring monument of the ceremonial worthy of the highest traditions of British statesmanship in India. Such concession would be in entire accord with precedent and the recognized policy of the British Government on similar occasions. When Her Gracious Majesty the late Queen assumed the direct government of India, a Durbar was held at Allahabad under the presidency of Lord Canning. A Proclamation was issued at that Durbar—it is the Proclamation of the 1st November 1858, the Magna Charta of our rights, which has been affirmed by successive Viceroys and has been accepted by Lord Curzon as the golden rule of his conduct. It removed all racial disabilities, and made merit the sole test of qualification for high office in India. It wiped out the badge of our political inferiority. It declared that whatever might have been the state of things in the days of the East India Company, a new regime had now dawned, and that under the direct government of the Crown there were to be no inequalities, based upon distinctions of race or creed, and that all British subjects in India were to enjoy equal rights and possess equal facilities for serving the State. The next ceremonial associated with the Sovereign was the great Durbar of 1877, at which Her late Majesty assumed the title of Empress of India. Lord Lytton presided at that ceremonial, and speaking as the representative of his Sovereign, he once again affirmed the principle of the Proclamation of the 1st November 1858:—

But you the natives of India, said he, whatever your race and whatever your creed, have a recognized claim to share largely with your English fellow-subjects according to your capacity for the task, in the administration of the country you inhabit. This claim is founded on the highest justice. It has repeatedly been

affirmed by British and Indian statesmen and by the legislation of the Imperial Parliament. It is recognized by the Government of India as binding on its honor and consistent with all the aims of its policy.

This authoritative declaration of Imperial policy, this solemn reaffirmation of the principle of equal treatment was followed by the creation of the Statutory Civil Service, which sought to render partial justice to the claims of the children of the soil for high and responsible office in the service of their own country. Then came the Jubilee of Her late Majesty. It was celebrated by a great Durbar held in Calcutta in February 1887, just 10 years after the Delhi Assemblage. Lord Dufferin presided at that celebration. Speaking as Viceroy and as the exponent of British policy in India, he foreshadowed the great boon which was soon to be bestowed and for which we hold his memory in grateful regard. He said in his Durbar speech :—

Glad and happy should I be, if during my sojourn among them (the people of India) circumstances permitted me to extend and to place upon a wider and more logical footing the political status which was so wisely given a generation ago by that great statesman, Lord Halifax, to such Indian gentlemen as by their influence, their acquirements and the confidence of their fellow-countrymen were marked out as useful adjuncts to our Legislative Councils.

This was said in 1887, and, in 1892, the Legislative Councils were enlarged and reconstituted, and for the first time in the history of India were placed upon a partially representative basis.

Thus since the direct assumption of the Government by the Crown, every ceremonial held in connection with the Sovereign and commemorative of her grace has been signalized by a substantial concession to the people. This has been the uniform, the invariable, the traditional policy of the British Government in India for a period of nearly half a century. It is associated with great and illustrious names and has been consistently followed, irrespective of party considerations, whether the Viceroy was Liberal or Conservative. And if one party more than another was pledged to this policy, one might say that it

was the Conservative party that was so pledged ; for all these Durbars were held and all these boons were conferred while a Conservative Ministry were in power, as if the great repositories of Conservative traditions wanted to proclaim to the people of India their firm and unalterable conviction that a policy of cautious but continuous progress was essential for the highest purposes of Imperial conservation. Having regard to the traditional policy of the British Government, the people of India look forward with confidence to the bestowal of some boon, the concession of some popular right, as commemorative of the occasion and of the affectionate interest which His Majesty feels in the welfare of his Indian subjects. To the people of India, it would be a grievous disappointment if, on this the first and the greatest ceremonial occasion in connection with the new reign, the traditional policy of the British Government, consecrated by illustrious names and followed with unvarying consistency for nearly half a century, were to be departed from. The traditional policy of the British Government in this matter is in entire keeping with the immemorial usage of the East where royal celebrations, especially those which commemorate the assumption of sovereign authority, are proclaimed to the people by beneficent gifts which evoke their gratitude, strengthen their loyalty and secure their attachment to the new Sovereign. It is, therefore, with all confidence that we would appeal to Lord Curzon to follow precedent and the immemorial usage of the East and convert what, it has been so confidently predicted would be a mere pageant, into a great historical event which will excite the love and reverence of the people, cement their loyalty, draw them closer to Britain and strengthen those ties of attachment between the two countries upon which the greatness of the British Empire and the prosperity of India alike depend.

THE UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION

Brother-delegates, it is useless to disguise from ourselves the fact that the question which of all others looms largely on the view, which has more or less thrown into the shade all other considerations and before which even the

attractions of the Delhi Durbar seem to fade from view is the question of University Education. The Report of the Universities Commission was till lately the one all absorbing topic of discussion. It excited a measure of interest such as no other public question within living memory has done. I am old enough to remember the controversies of the last quarter of a century. I have in my own humble way been associated with them. My contributions to them were, indeed, insignificant; but my interest in them was deep and abiding; and this I will say that I do not remember any proposal, emanating from responsible authority, which has more profoundly stirred the hearts of the Indian community, or has caused deeper alarm, or evoked more strenuous opposition than the Report of the Universities Commission. The opposition to the Vernacular Press Act, to the Calcutta Municipal Bill, the Bombay Land Revenue Bill, or even the Sedition Bill, pales before the agitation which the Report of the Universities Commission gave rise to. There was a sense of alarm, deep, genuine, all-pervading, felt by all sections of the educated community throughout India, by Hindus and Mussalmans alike. Retired servants of Government, whom the Government delighted to honour, whom they have loaded with titles and distinctions and who have led their quiet lives, away from the storm and stress of political agitation, felt themselves constrained under a sense of overwhelming duty and in response to the general feeling of their community, to emerge from the seclusion of their quiet lives and place themselves on a line with those who condemned the Report. Old men, bent down with the weight of years, the representatives of an older school of thought and culture, the products of our pre-University system, came tottering to the Town Hall Meeting to place on record their protest against the recommendations of the Commission. Professional men who had never before spoken at a public meeting and who had never identified themselves with any movement of any kind, but had earned their laurels in the quiet and undisturbed pursuit of their own professions, which were far too remunerative to permit them to

think of anything else, for the moment forgot their professions and their profits and joined the general community in the universal protest against the recommendations of the Commission. The Mahomedan community, unhappily for themselves, unhappily for us, have been somewhat backward in our public movements. They have been most forward in condemning the Report. They have promptly disavowed the representative character of the only Mahomedan member of the Commission and denounced him for signing a Report which they rightly believed would be fatal to the educational interests of their community. And if out of evil cometh good, it may truly be said that the Report of the Commission has furthered in an unforeseen and unexpected fashion the general interests of the community, by bringing Hindus and Mahomedans upon the same platform and linking them together by association in a common cause. It has thus helped to promote that solidarity between the two communities which it has ever been the steadfast aim of the Congress to secure and upon which the interests of both the communities and the prospects of Indian advancement so largely depend. The feeling of alarm was genuine, widespread and universal, and well might it be; for the noblest gift which British Rule has conferred upon India is the boon of high education. It lies at the root of all our progress. It is the main-spring, the motive-power, the germinal source of all those forces which make for progress. The three great boons which we have received from the British Government are High Education, the gift of a Free Press and Local Self-Government, supplemented by the reform and expansion of the Councils. But high education is the most-prized, the most dearly-cherished of them all. It is high education which has made Local Self-Government the success that it is admitted to be. It is again high education which has elevated the tone of the Indian Press, has made it a power and has rendered it possible for us to look forward to the time when, in the words of Lord Ripon, it will become, as in Europe it is, "the irresistible and the unresisted master of the Government". It is English education which has produced 'a splendid galaxy of

distinguished men who have done incalculable service to morals and manners, who have ennobled the literature of their country and have made it a rich vehicle for the expression of the noblest sentiments, of the most abstruse reasonings in philosophy and science and of the varied and complicated requirements of modern life. It is English education which has overcome the barriers of race, religion and language, has dissipated the prejudices and misunderstandings of ages and has created those unifying influences which find a living expression in this vast, this stupendous, this majestic organization of the National Congress. Could the educated community submit to the curtailment of this boon—to the restriction of its beneficent area? They are naturally anxious that nothing should be done to check the spread of that system of education which has produced such splendid results in the past and which is fraught with infinite possibilities of progress for future generations. English education is a precious boon which has come down to us as a heritage from the past. If we cannot extend and broaden it, it ought at any rate to be our most sacred concern to safeguard it against encroachment and limitation, and so transmit it, with its beneficent area undiminished, to those who coming after us will bear our names. These are the feelings which inspired the agitation, intensified its volume and impressed upon it its distinctive tone and character. In our anxiety we appealed to Lord Curzon. It was united India which preferred its appeal to the Viceroy. Every province took part in it. Every section of the educated community was represented in it. Whatever differences of opinion may exist with regard to the merits of Lord Curzon's administration—and the time has not yet come for the final judgment—all will agree, even those who see nothing good in it, that His Excellency is keenly responsive to the intimations of public opinion, and we felt convinced that His Excellency would not ignore the public opinion of educated India, expressed with singular unanimity and unequalled emphasis and upon a question which to them was a question of life and death. In this hope we have not been disappointed. His Excellency has recognized the

truth, in the letter of Government to which I shall presently call attention, that no reform can be successful without the sympathetic co-operation of the community concerned, and that any reform, forced upon an unwilling community, no matter how promising it might be, no matter how influentially supported it might be, is doomed, foredoomed to failure. We desire to offer our congratulations to His Excellency, upon his circular letter upon the Report of the Universities Commission. We may not be able to agree with all the suggestions of the Vicoroy, but it is a frank and straightforward recognition of public opinion—it is a praiseworthy attempt at compromise and conciliation; and effective compromise which ensures steady progress along the line of least resistance and which conciliates and enlists the social forces on behalf of Government is, to my mind, the highest function of statesmanship. His Excellency has always felt a personal interest in the educational problem. Himself a distinguished University man, His Excellency has told us that the instinct of the educationist is deep down in his nature. The educational problem is one of his twelve chosen problems, and His Excellency has applied himself with characteristic ardour to its solution. So far back as the summer of 1901, a Conference was held at Simla to which some European educational experts were invited. The proceedings of that Conference have not been published. I fail to understand why they should be withheld from publication. If there is one class of considerations more than another in regard to which the public should be taken into confidence, it is those who relate to the problem of education. Here, if anywhere, popular sympathy and co-operation is necessary. No useful purpose is served by investing educational problems with a *quasi*-political character and raising them to the dignity of State-secrets. A suspicious public, barred out of the confidence of the authorities, naturally interpret their proceedings in their own way and ascribe to them a sense and a significance which they perhaps will not bear, and thus between them and the Government there arises a misunderstanding when their mutual sympathy and co-operation is needed for the satisfactory solution of the

educational problem. I can quote no higher authority against this policy of concealment in educational matters than that of His Excellency the Viceroy. Thus did His Excellency denounce the policy of secrecy in educational matters at the Conference whose proceedings have been withheld from publication :—

Concealment has been no part of my policy since I have been in India and the education of the people is annually the last subject to which I should think of applying any such canon.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION

The Conference was followed by the appointment in January 1902, of the Universities Commission. The Commission was appointed

to enquire into the condition and prospects of the Universities established in British India; to consider and report upon any proposals which have been, or may be, made for improving their constitution and working, and to recommend to the Governor-General in Council such measures as may tend to elevate the standard of University teaching, and to promote the advancement of learning.

The Report of the Commission has long been before the public; and the views of the Government thereon have recently been published. His Excellency the Viceroy, while according a general support to the Report of the Commission, has not been able to accept all its conclusions. If there is one quality more than another which distinguishes the Viceroy, it is that he is the keeper of his own concession, that he does not surrender his judgment or his convictions to the authority of names, however distinguished. I am bound to say that the constitution of the Commission was such, its method of procedure was such, that it was impossible that its recommendations could command the general approval of the public or the unqualified assent of the Government. The Commission originally consisted of six members, with the Hon'ble Mr. Raleigh, Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, as President. Not a single representative of the great Hindu community, who had the largest stake in the educational problems under consideration, was included amongst the Commissioners as originally nominated. Let us, however, thankfully

note that when attention was called to this omission in the columns of the public prints, His Excellency was graciously pleased to nominate the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Guru Dass Banerjee as a member of the Commission. The appointment of Mr. Justice Banerjee was received with universal approbation. One of the most brilliant graduates of the Calcutta University, he has long been honourably associated with the work of the University. He was twice appointed Vice-Chancellor of the University, and he was among the most distinguished of our Vice-Chancellors, regarding his office not as an ornamental adjunct to the high position which he held, but a new field of activity and usefulness, and setting an example of unflinching devotion to duty and of statesmanlike concern in the interests of the University, of which he was so fine a product. Who will say that the Calcutta University has been a failure or has not fulfilled the high ends of its existence when it has produced men like Mr. Justice Guru Dass Banerjee? The Commission, as now constituted, consisted of seven members, of whom five were officials, the sixth was a missionary gentleman, and the last but not the least was the Mahomedan member of the Viceroy's Council, whose experience of educational matters is confined to the Nizam's Dominions. His representative character has been disavowed by his community, and he has been described by my friend the Hon'ble Mr. Mehta and his colleagues of the Bombay Presidency Association in their memorial to the Viceroy as being disqualified to represent the views and feelings of the educated community, by reason of the avowedly hostile attitude he has taken towards them in his public writings and speeches.

EDUCATION COMMISSIONS & UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION

In our Presidency, private effort covers a large area of the field of education. The total number of colleges affiliated to the Calcutta University is 78. Out of these, so many as 59 are private unaided colleges which were founded and are now maintained by Indian gentlemen. It is unfortunate that the interests of the unaided colleges were not represented on the Commission; and the

omission is all the more regrettable in view of the recommendations of the Commission, some of which so seriously affect their position and status. The Government educational interests and those of the missionary bodies were represented on the Commission but not those of the unaided colleges. The conclusion is forced upon us that the constitution of the Commission was defective, and this view is emphasized by a reference to the *personnel* of the Education Commission of 1882. On that Commission, to use the words of Mr. Buckland, Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal, were "departmental and executive officers of Government and representatives of the educated community of each province except Burma to which the enquiry was not extended."—Buckland's "Bengal under the Lieutenant-Governors," Vol. II, page 766. No such principle has been followed in determining the constitution of the Universities Commission; and yet it must be admitted that if the representatives of the educated community were qualified to advise the Government in framing its educational policy in 1882, they must be presumed to be far more qualified for the task in 1902. To hold otherwise would be to assume that in the twenty years which have since elapsed, the educated community have retrograded, despite the earnest efforts of the Government to stimulate their progress. Such an astounding assumption has not been made even by our worst detractors. We are justified therefore in holding that the non-inclusion of provincial representatives of that community among the members of the Universities Commission was a departure from the policy followed by the Government of India in 1882, and it was a departure which, I have no hesitation in saying, is largely responsible for a Report which has caused so much stir and dissatisfaction. I will even go further and add that the policy followed in this case is in entire conflict with the principle laid down by His Excellency the Viceroy in the constitution of Commissions and Committees appointed by the Government. Referring to the difficulties attending the constitution of Indian Commissions, His Excellency, in his Budget Speech of March last, observed :—

There is the reference to be drawn up, involving long and anxious study, the Secretary of State to be consulted, the consent of his Council obtained, the members to be selected by a careful balance of the interests and merits, not merely of individuals, but of provinces, races, and even of creeds.

Where, may I ask, was the careful balancing of interests in the constitution of the Universities Commission, not only as regards individuals, but also as regards provinces, races and creeds? I am well aware that at each University centre a local member was attached to the Commission for the purpose of the enquiry at that centre. But these gentlemen did not sign the Report, and as the Commissioners themselves say, "they are in no way responsible for the substance of the Report".

Nor is this the only point of difference between the two Commissions—the Education Commission of 1882 and the Universities Commission of 1902. The care and deliberation, which the Education Commission brought to bear upon their task, are in striking contrast with the hurry, and I was going to add, the precipitancy with which the Universities Commission finished their work. The Universities Commission was constituted on the 27th January 1902; Dr. Guru Dass Banerjee's name was added on the 12th February, so that we may fairly assume that, barring perhaps the settlement of preliminaries, no work had been done till the 12th February and the Report was submitted on the 9th June. Thus the work of "enquiry into the condition and prospects of the Universities established in British India (of which there are five), the consideration of proposals for improving their constitution and working, and the recommendations calculated to elevate the standard of University teaching and promote the advancement of learning" were all finished in four months' time! Now contrast this hurried work with the prolonged and careful enquiry of the Education Commission. The Commission was appointed in February 1882. They submitted their Report in September 1883. They took nearly eighteen months to finish their work. The Universities Commission submitted

their Report in less than one-fourth the time taken up by the Education Commission. There is yet another point of comparison which cannot escape observation. The Education Commission, like most other Commissions, drew up questions which had been carefully thought out, and which were sent to the witnesses for them to consider and draw up their answers. The Universities Commission did no such thing. No questions were drawn up by them; but in Bengal a Note was circulated (and I presume the same procedure was followed elsewhere) calling attention to the points upon which the witnesses were to be interrogated, and it is remarkable that in the Bengal Note not the smallest reference was made to some of the proposals which gave rise to so much controversy such as, for instance, the abolition of the 2nd Grade Colleges and the Law Classes; and not one of these witnesses, so far as I am aware, was asked to give an opinion regarding the proposals. Here again I must confess to a sense of disappointment that the evidence of the witnesses, who were examined before the Commission, has not yet been published. The public ought surely to know whether the drastic recommendations of the Commission are supported by evidence, and if so, what the nature of the evidence is. Nothing is gained by secrecy in a matter of this kind. Trust begets trust, and great as are the difficulties which surround the educational problem, they are aggravated by a policy of half confidence which is apt to create suspicion and mistrust. I am not one of those who believe that any sinister political motive lies veiled behind the Report of the Commission. I do not regard the Report as a political manifesto in an academic guise; but I am bound to say that if any such feeling is entertained in any quarter, the hesitating policy of half trust and half mistrust is mainly responsible for it. Liberalism has been defined by Mr. Gladstone as trust in the people tempered by discretion. I am afraid the policy followed in this case must be described as one of mistrust, tempered by discretion. I rejoice to find that the letter of Government on the Report of the Commission sounds a different

note. Here a genuine attempt is made to take the public into confidence.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

In approaching the consideration of the Report of the Commission, it will at once be conceded that the University system in India is not perfect, any more than any other human institution is; and a cautious and well-devised scheme of reform, calculated to promote the advancement of learning without interfering with the spread of high education, would be welcomed by the educated community; for they realize the truth that their future progress largely depends upon a sound system of education which would qualify them for the hard and increasingly difficult competition of modern life. As His Highness the Gaekwar of Baroda has observed with great truth in his admirable article in the *East and West*, education will be the watchword of the twentieth century and the diffusion of education, the great object upon which will be concentrated the energies and the statesmanship of the century. Could we persuade ourselves to believe that the recommendations of the Commission would secure the advancement of learning without restricting its area and that it would combine height with surface, there would go forth a mighty voice from educated India, supporting the Report of the Commission and offering to the Commissioners our cordial congratulations. But the Commissioners themselves admit—and the scope of their Report leaves no doubt on the subject—that the effect of their proposals would be to narrow the popular basis of higher education and to restrict its area. It is against this policy and the recommendations which lead to it that we desire to record our respectful but emphatic protest. We cannot accept a policy which would deprive our great middle class who are far from being well off, from whom come our intellectual classes who, with their keen hereditary instincts, have from time immemorial furnished the intellectual leaders of the community, to be deprived of some of those opportunities of high education which they now enjoy. The recommendations of the Commission which embody this policy may be summarized as

follows :—(1) The fixing of a minimum rate of college fees by the Syndicate; (2) the abolition of the 2nd Grade Colleges; and (3) the abolition of the Law Classes. All these proposals involve the direct discouragement of private effort which has done so much to stimulate the spread of high English education, and they are in entire conflict with the educational policy of the past. That policy is embodied in great Education Despatch of 1854, which has been followed with unvarying consistency by the Government of India for the last fifty years. The cardinal features of that policy may be described as the extension of "the means of acquiring general European knowledge" and the encouragement of private effort by a system of grants-in-aid, wherever necessary. Let us here gratefully acknowledge that the Government of India in their circular letter on the Report of the Universities Commission emphatically disclaim any intention of receding from the policy of 1854; and as a necessary corollary they do not support some of the proposals of the Commission which must seriously impede the sustained movement of private effort. The Government recognize that the second-grade colleges occupy a definite place in our educational machinery and perform a useful function. Again in the matter of legal education, the Government claim no monopoly, though they are inclined to support the establishment of a Central College at each University Centre which would serve as a model. Both as regards the Law Classes and the Second Grade Colleges, so long as efficiency is maintained, the Government of India are not inclined to interfere with them. Thus in regard to two very important questions which elicited the unanimous protest of the educated community, the Government of India make a definite concession to popular opinion, for which we are truly grateful. The Government, indeed, declare their firm adhesion to the policy of the Education Despatch in regard to the encouragement of private effort, but subject to the qualification that "the sole condition upon which private enterprise can be encouraged is, that the education which it offers is reasonably efficient". Evidently, the Government of India are of opinion that the

time has come when private effort should be restrained rather than stimulated, when its exuberance should be pruned down rather than that it should be encouraged to shoot forth into a vigorous growth. Far different was the spirit in which the Government of India approached the consideration of this question in 1882. They deprecated any uniform system of education which would, in their felicitous language, "cast the youth of the country in the same official mould", and they went on to observe that:

It is not in the opinion of the Governor-General in Council, a healthy symptom that all the youth of the country should be cast as it were in the same official mould. . . . - The Government is ready, therefore, to do all that it can to foster such a spirit of independence and self-help. It is willing to hand over any of its own colleges and schools in suitable cases to bodies of native gentlemen who will undertake to manage them satisfactorily as aided institutions. All that the Government will insist upon being that provision is made for efficient management and extended usefulness.

It will be seen that the method of enunciation of the same policy is substantially different, and the spirit is different. While in 1882, the Government was anxious to do all that it could to foster a spirit of independence and self-help; in 1902, it lays special stress upon the need of restraining the efforts to private enterprise. In 1882, the Government did not ignore considerations of efficiency; in 1902, it dwells upon them with great emphasis. We are at one with the Government in insisting upon a standard of efficiency. But it should not be of the ideal order. It should be fixed with reference to the circumstances of a people who are notoriously poor. The Government, indeed, recognize the fact "that the standard of efficiency, which it is proper and possible to enforce in India, is admittedly not so high as that which is attained in more advanced countries". Public opinion will support the Government in all reasonable efforts to check the growth of institutions which are both cheap and worthless; but do not the result of the University Examinations afford a good test of efficiency, and is there not the self-acting principle, inexorable in its operation, that things nasty and cheap must disappear from a world where the survival of the fittest

is the Universal Law? The process may be slow, but it is sure, and moving as it does along the line of least resistance, it is attended with the minimum of disturbance. There seems to be an ideal in official quarters that the aided, and in a still larger measure, the unaided colleges are not as efficient as they might be. But what about the Government Colleges? Are they always models of excellence and efficiency? Do we not occasionally hear in connection with them of serious breaches of discipline and of drastic measures enforced to ensure respect for authority? If there is to be a standard of efficiency, let it be of uniform application, and not judged solely by reference to external appliances, such as libraries and laboratories, but by the larger, though perhaps more impalpable, moral results, which it is the aim and the end of all education to secure. The efficiency of the affiliated colleges is tested by the annual examinations of the University. It is to their interest that their students should be successful and occupy high places at the examinations. They have thus to study efficiency from the point of view of self-interest, and efficiency is best ensured when it is associated with a motive which so powerfully appeals to our strongest impulses.

I may say that I attach considerable importance to the University Examinations as a test of efficiency. They are now practically the sole test upon which the Universities rely. They were deemed sufficient by the founders of the Universities and those who, inheriting their traditions, worked upon their lines. Are they not an exceedingly efficient test if the examinations are properly conducted and suitable question papers are set? If the tests which are now applied were tests of general intellectual capacity rather than of memory, then we should hear less of the inefficiency of our Universities. But the general impression is that the examination papers are not what they should be; and no one has been more eloquent or more incisive in their denunciation than His Excellency the Viceroy. Yet through the whole of the Report of the Universities Commission, we look in vain for a single suggestion or a single definite recommendation, by which the system of University Examinations might be improved.

THE RATE OF COLLEGE FEES

It is considerations of efficiency which have determined the attitude of the Government in regard to the question of college fees. On this question the Government are apparently inclined to support the recommendation of the Commission. Efficiency, they say, is difficult to measure, its estimation is open to dispute, and the principle that with a fee-scale below a certain limit, efficiency in a college without considerable endowments or subscriptions is impossible is one for which there is much to be said. But if the scale is so fixed as to substantially reduce the number of students, the increase in the rate of fees would defeat its object and diminish the total receipts of the college from that source. Further, the raising of the fees would throw difficulties in the way of the higher education of the deserving poor. The diffusion of education among the people, including the deserving poor, has been the steadfast concern of Governments in the past. This policy has received the sanction of the high authority of His Excellency the Viceroy.

Care must be taken, said the Government of India in their Resolution on the Report of the Education Commission of 1882, that no unnecessary obstacles are thrown in the way of the upward progress of really deserving students of the poorer classes. The Governor-General in Council has no wish to close the doors of high education to all but the wealthiest members of the native community.

His Excellency Lord Curzon emphatically endorses this policy and says in the letter of Government that nothing can be further from the wishes of the Government of India than "to initiate a policy which would make education the monopoly of the rich". But if heavy fees are levied, higher education must necessarily become the privilege of the few. If the fees are now adequate, any addition to them would operate in the nature of a restriction imposed upon the poorer sections of the community who supply the bulk of our students. The whole problem therefore resolves itself into this: Is the present scale of fees adequate or not? The question was carefully considered by the Education Commission of 1882, and they

were of opinion that the rates then levied were generally adequate, regard being had to the fact that the majority of the college students belong to the struggling middle class. They did not, indeed, write without chapter and verse ; for they observed :

The great landed proprietors are scarcely, if at all, represented (in our colleges). In Bengal, the income of more than half the parents is assessed at sums varying from £20 to £200 a year.

If the college fees were adequate in 1812, having regard to the then condition of the middle class, they cannot now be considered as being inadequate or insufficiently low. The condition of the middle class has not improved, while the prices of provisions and of the necessary articles of life have arisen. If anything, the condition of the middle class has become worse. The salaries of Government servants are fixed, and the Indian servants of Government receive no exchange compensation allowance. The income of lawyers in 1902 is, I am afraid, much less than what it was in 1882. There is thus no reason to assume that the fees paid in 1902, which are slightly higher than those paid in 1882, are insufficient or inadequately low ; and if not, any attempt to raise them must necessarily restrict the area of high education. There is, indeed, an upward trend in the direction of fees, and the movement may be left to itself without the stimulus of external pressure. Scholarships and endowments may, indeed, help the poorer students. But scholarships must be available only to a few of the deserving poor, and they will also be open to the deserving rich.

And where are the private endowments in aid of education ? Nature is not rich in her choicest productions ; and a Tata and a Carnegie and a Wadia who divests himself of his all for the benefit of mankind, are as rare as they are the noblest types of their race. I very much fear endowments would not be forthcoming for educational purposes, unless a movement in their favour were started under such distinguished auspices as have crowned the Victoria Memorial and the Lady Dufferin Fund with success.

Educated opinion is in entire accord with Dr. Guru Dass Banerjee's view of the question :

That the minimum rate of college fees should be left to adjust itself according to the circumstances of each province, and the Universities should not interfere in determining it unless there are very strong reasons for doing so.

We are naturally anxious that nothing should be done to interfere with the diffusion of high education among the great middle class. The noblest products of English education have all come from this class, the deserving poor if you like. Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar, Mahadev Govind Ranade, Kristo Das Pal, Dadabhai Naoroji, and other too numerous to be mentioned here, were all sprung from the middle class. Their education made them the benefactors of their country. They were an honour to the educational system under which they were brought up. Are doors of high education to be closed against men of this class by the imposition of prohibitive fees? As the *Statesman* newspaper, which has done yeoman's service in this controversy and to which the grateful acknowledgments of the Indian community are due, says with great force :

If a certain standard of efficiency is insisted on, what need is there for the Government to go behind that condition and concern itself about the cost and the way in which it is defrayed?

We trust that His Excellency the Viceroy, whose attitude throughout this controversy has been so eminently conciliatory, will be graciously pleased to accept the views of Mr. Justice Banerjee who, by reason of his knowledge of local conditions and intimate touch with the middle class, of which he is so bright an ornament, was really far more competent to advise the Government on this matter than any other member of the Commission. I can only express my surprise that Mr. Syed Hossain Belgrami should not have associated himself with Mr. Justice Banerjee in this part of his Note of Dissent, for the community from which he comes is far less able than almost any other community in India to pay a high rate of fees. The replies given by the Secretary of State to the questions

put by Mr. Caine in the House of Commons will have a reassuring effect on the public mind, for Lord George Hamilton said that he had no doubt that the interests of the poorer students would not be ignored by the Government.

HOW EFFICIENCY IS BEST SECURED

Efficiency is the key-note of the letter of Government. We should be false to ourselves if we did not cordially co-operate with the Government in securing the efficiency of our educational institutions, consistently with the pecuniary circumstances of our people and the diffusion of high education. But it seems to me that no great forward stride towards educational efficiency is possible without a distinct improvement in the efficiency of the professoriate. "What is vital for the highest function of University," says Mr. Sidney Webb, "is the professoriate and its environment." The late Dr. Thring, one of the greatest educationists that England has produced, remarked (and the remark is quoted with approbation by His Excellency the Viceroy) "that Education is the transmission of life from the living through the living to the living". But I am afraid that in many cases the professors here have no life to communicate, no generous impulse, no noble enthusiasm, no soul-stirring ardour for truth and freedom to impart to those who sit at their feet and derive from them the pulsations of their intellectual and moral life. Is there a nobler profession than that of the teacher? To them are entrusted the destinies of youth. They are the up-builders and the architects of the future. They make or mar the fortunes of a country. But how many teachers are there among us who realize their grave responsibilities or rise to the height of their truly divine mission? Raise the status of the teacher—dignify and elevate his calling—draw to the professoriate those of the countrymen who will embrace it, not as a mere bread-earning profession, but a high calling, a heaven-appointed task, a self-dedication to a sacred purpose, and you will not need Commissions and Committees, Reports and Resolutions to secure the efficiency of our Universities and

the advancement of learning. The names of great teachers form landmarks in the educational history of this country. They have done more for the cause of education than all the Resolutions, all the Regulations, all the fine maxims and even all the pious aspirations which have emanated from responsible authority. DeRozio, the Eurasian youth, who fired with apostolic fervour communicated a new life and a strange impulse to the youth of Bengal in the early days of British Rule; Pyari Churn Sircar who loved his students almost as dearly as he loved his children; Ramtanu Lahiri, and in a lesser sense, Rajnarain Bose, who led them onwards and upwards to a higher and diviner life, have rendered a service to the cause of learning and of morals which will be remembered as long as the history of English education in India is treasured up in our minds. In Bombay, you had your great Dr. Wordsworth and Sir Alexander Grant; in other Presidencies there are familiar names. We want men like them to leaven the professoriate and the cause of education, and the advancement of learning will be secure. But the Report, and, I regret to say the letter of Government, are silent about this most important consideration. Not even the semblance of a suggestion is thrown out for the improvement of the professoriate, without which educational efficiency would be all but attainable. For this purpose the improvement of the status of the Educational Service is necessary; and nowhere is such improvement more urgently required than in the subordinate branches of the Service, where the pay is small and the duties grave and responsible.

For purposes of efficiency I maintain that the diffusion of education is necessary; for an appropriate environment must be created. Height is only possible where the foundations are broad and deep, suitable to the noble edifice that is sought to be raised thereon. Advancement of learning is best secured and under conditions which guarantee permanence, where the general culture of the community is maintained on a high level. A cultured public opinion, sustaining and stimulating the advancement of

learning, is a more effective ally of knowledge than all the artificial pressure which the most enlightened Government, aided by the resources of unlimited power, may exert. But the formation of such opinion presupposes the wide diffusion of knowledge. Let there be efficiency, but let it never be forgotten that efficiency involves, not the restriction, but the expansion of the educational area—it is a double movement, combining height with surface. Writing on the lines on which the London University should be organized, Mr. Sidney Webb, a high educational authority to whom I have already referred, thus comments on the importance of the spread of education among the general community:—

Being, *as regards its undergraduate class*, essentially a university for the sons and daughters of households of limited means and strenuous lives, it will not, like Oxford and Cambridge, set itself to skim from the surface of society the topmost layer of rich men's sons and scholarship winners. Wisely organised and adequately endowed, it must dive deep down through every stratum of its seven millions of constituents, selecting by the tests of personal ambition and endurance, of talent and "grit", for all the brain-working professions and for scientific research, every capable recruit that London rears. Hence it must stand ready to enrol in its under-graduate ranks not hundreds a year but thousands. If we remember that Paris and Berlin drawing from much smaller local populations and exposed each to the competition of a score of other universities in their own countries have each actually twelve thousand university students, we can see that any equally effective London University might easily number twenty thousand.

CRAM

I am in strong sympathy with those who wish to discourage cram. I do not, indeed, believe that little learning is a dangerous thing. To me it seems that it is much more dangerous to the community than the rulers of men should be the victim of such a mischievous hallucination. Little learning is certainly better than no learning, as well-digested knowledge which strengthens the judgment and invigorates the understanding is infinitely preferable to the ill-assimilated stuff which is not incorporated into the intellectual system and does not strengthen its fibre or enrich its texture. In the discipline

of the mind, the cultivation of the memory is, of course, not to be neglected. The memory is the handmaid of the understanding and often supplies to it the materials upon which its pronouncements are based. But the understanding is the sovereign faculty in the intellectual system, and it should not be sacrificed for the sake of a subordinate power. But how is cram to be discouraged and the understanding strengthened? I regret to have to say that the report of the Universities Commission supplies no answer to the question. It is the multiplicity of books and the multiplicity of subjects which produce a bewildering confusion and tempt the student to rely upon his memory rather than upon his understanding. He must anyhow pass the examination. The subjects and the books are too many and the time is too short to permit him to master them and to assimilate into his intellectual system the food which they supply. If the subjects and books were fewer, he would have leisure for careful study, and would reap those great intellectual benefits which careful study confers. As it is, he races through his books and subjects at railway speed—and like the carrier, glad to be relieved of his burden, he flings them away as soon as the destined goal of the examination is reached, rejoicing that he has at last obtained his release, vowing that he will not come within a measurable distance of the Examination Hall, or of his books or his studies, if he can possibly help it. To anticipate that under such a system there could grow that generous enthusiasm for knowledge, that craving for learning for learning's sake, which is the object of all education to foster and promote, is to indulge in the wildest dream. Often under the strain, the unhappy student breaks down, physically and mentally—a complete wreck in every sense of the term. What is to be the remedy? Reduce the number of books; reduce the number of subjects; give more breathing time to the teacher and the taught; let them rejoice in the company of the celestials of the Earth; let the company of the celestials be to them a pleasure and not an infliction; let them drink deep their spirit, and the sovereign remedy against cram will have been found and the highest ends of education served.

But the Commission, instead of reducing the already heavy burden on the student, proposes a sensible addition by recommending an additional subject for the B. A. Examination of the Calcutta University. In the Calcutta University it was after a hard fight that the number of subjects for the B. A. Examination was reduced from four to three by the almost unanimous vote of the Senate. A Teachers' Conference, which recently sat in Calcutta, unanimously protested against the proposed increase in the number of subjects for the B. A. Examination. There is too great a disposition in some quarters to forget that a wide area of surface in academic instruction often involves a sacrifice of depth. The practical teacher is confronted with this difficulty every moment of his life, but the *doctrinaire*, safe in his ignorance, is apt to overlook a consideration, so simple and yet so imperative. And here I must be permitted to deprecate the application of the same hard-and-fast system to all the Indian Universities, such as the University Commission apparently contemplates. It is very obvious that a uniform system applied to a whole continent, to populations in varying stages of progress and separated by wide differences in condition and circumstances, in intellectual capacity and aspirations, must end in failure. The Commission seemed to have ignored this obvious consideration and have framed a scheme of educational reform, which takes no cognizance of local needs and circumstances and the widely divergent conditions which prevail in the different provinces of India. Surely, the question as to what should be the right curriculum for the B. A. Degree Examination in the different Universities is a matter which might be left to the Universities themselves to decide and to determine.

Mr. Syed Hossein Belgrami has signed the Report, but another Mr. Belgrami (Mr. Syed Ali Belgrami) makes the very complaint which I have here ventured to urge. Mr. Belgrami institutes a comparison between the courses of study in the English Universities and those of the Universities here. He finds that from the Entrance Examination to the end of his course, the student in India

has to study more subjects than the English student. Not only has the English student to pass in a smaller range of subjects to enter a University; but after he passes he is allowed to specialise, and if the English University has an intermediate examination, it is rather designed to serve as a guide to his special aptitude, as a preparation for his pass examination than as a test for his general knowledge. As the *Pioneer* observes the Indian student has to spend his time and industry over many subjects and in the words of Seneca, he learns merely to speak with others and not with himself. Despite these facts we are told that our degrees are cheap, and that educated India is interested in keeping them cheap. Never was a more unfounded calumny uttered, and the marvel is that it should have been given currency to, by so well-informed and so responsible an organ of public opinion as the *Times* newspaper.

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

The Commission attaches considerable importance to the teaching of English. Considering that English is to us the key to the learning and culture of the West, I may say that I am in sympathy with this view. But it must be observed that the methods suggested by the Commission admit of considerable differences of opinion. There are (1) that candidates must obtain 40 per cent. of the marks for English in order to pass the Entrance Examination; (2) that it is undesirable that text-books should be prescribed in English at the Entrance Examination. As regards the first of these recommendations, I am well aware that it has been unanimously recommended by a Committee of the Calcutta University, consisting of distinguished educational experts whose views are entitled to the highest respect. Will it raise the standard of knowledge of English, possessed by candidates for the Matriculation generally? It will certainly reduce the number and percentage of successful candidates, but it will not raise the knowledge of English of the candidates generally. That must depend upon the teaching and upon the general efficiency of our schools. Here, again, the supreme

importance of an efficient tutorial and professional staff forces itself upon the attention.

As regards the proposal for the abolition of text-books for the Entrance Examination, I understand there are no text-books for the Matriculation at Madras and Bombay. In Calcutta, the system was tried some years back and was abandoned. It seems to me that the best means of teaching English at the stage of progress, at which the candidate has arrived when he prepares himself for the Entrance Examination, is to prescribe for him suitable text-books. They should be limited in their number, and he should be well-grounded in them. He should have time to read them over and over again, so that he may be in a position to master the vocabulary, the idioms, the grammar, and appreciate and admire not only the literary beauties but the pregnant moral lessons which may abound in his text-books. To leave him without text-books at this stage of progress is to leave him without rudder and compass—it is to leave him to the unknown and unknowable chapter of accidents in the arduous task to master one of the most difficult languages in the world. The questions set at the Examination need not be confined to the text-book. They should be a test, not of memory, but of his real knowledge of the language.

TEACHING UNIVERSITIES

The Commission, in the opening words of their summary of recommendations, say :

The legal powers of the older Universities should be enlarged, so that all the Universities may be organized as teaching bodies. The Commissioners devote a few paragraphs of their Report to the consideration of the question of Teaching Universities. They recommend "that the Universities may justify their existence as teaching bodies by making further and better provision for advanced courses of study.

They suggest that the Universities should appoint their lecturers and provide libraries and laboratories, the College being required to contribute, by means of scholarships or otherwise, to the maintenance of those

students who take advantage of the University courses. One of the advantages of this plan, says the Report, is that it can be worked out gradually and without the great initial expense which the creation of a complete professoriate would involve. I fail to understand why the Government should not take the entire responsibility of maintaining at each University centre a central school of advanced study which would draw to it the best graduates of the University, animated by a thirst of knowledge and eager for the pursuit of more advanced courses of study. Such a central school would stimulate the pursuit of higher knowledge and exercise a healthy influence upon our educational system. There is no reason why the Presidency College in Calcutta should not at once be converted into a University College of this kind, dealing exclusively with post-graduate courses of study. The State is deeply interested in the higher education of the community, and the State must find the means for providing facilities for such education. The Tokio University, maintained by the Japanese Government, is a teaching University. Surely, the British Indian Government is not going to proclaim to the world that it is unequal to the educational responsibilities which the Japanese Government has assumed. The question is one of finance, but when our Government is as rich as the richest in the world in the readiness with which it adds to the Military expenditure of the Empire, we have a right to expect at least an equal measure of generosity in dealing with a problem which so intimately affects the happiness and the progress of the people. The Government in its letter on the Report of the Universities Commission recognises the fact that the whole question of University Reform is one of finance; and the foremost of these reforms, for which no expense should be grudged, is that which relates to the provision for University-teaching for the higher courses of knowledge. Here, indeed, is a splendid field for private liberality; but Government must set the example, and private liberality in this country, at any rate, flows with added impetus under the fostering care of Government.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITIES

There is no part of the Report of the Universities Commission which has elicited a stronger protest or evoked more widespread dissent than that which deals with the constitution of the Universities. The cry has been raised—and there is abundant justification for it—that if the recommendations of the Commission in this respect were to be accepted, the Universities would be reduced to so many Departments of the State. A correspondent writing to the *Times* from India (and the *Times* gave special prominence to his letter) says that a popularly controlled University is anomalous and impracticable, and State control can alone ensure efficiency; and he has the hardihood to assure the British Public that the tentative policy of placing the Universities, under more or less popular control, has nowhere given satisfaction and has in many instances led to results which may be described as scandalous. A more malignant libel has never been uttered against our Universities. I am not here to defend the Universities, but we should like to have chapter and verse. We should like to have a categorical enumeration of the alleged scandals which the present system has given rise to. Let the indictment be framed—if indeed it can be framed, and we shall know how to meet it. In the meantime, I will take leave to record my personal protest against the condemnation of our Universities by an appeal to calumnies which will not stand a moment's scrutiny. But whatever the irresponsible writer in the *Times* may say and whatever support the *Times* may accord to him, it is very evident that His Excellency the Viceroy attaches considerable importance to the public protest which this part of the Report has elicited. His Excellency does not apparently accept the proposal of the Commission that the Director of Public Instruction should be *ex officio* Vice-Chairman of the Syndicate. The Senate will continue to be the final authority in the matter of the recognition of schools. The elective principle will be definitely recognized in the constitution of the Senate. May we not appeal to His Excellency to continue and broaden the policy of the past

and still further popularize the University by providing that at least one-half of the members of the Senate should be elected by the graduates of the University of a certain standing. The graduates have a permanent and an affectionate interest in their Universities, and in all that conduces to their credit and reputation. Their participation in the affairs of their Universities would inspire them with a sense of responsibility and would enlist, on behalf of educational reforms, the sympathy and support of the educated community. There is no desire on the part of any one to divest the Universities of State control. Such control, however, should be in the nature of general supervision rather than that of direct and active participation in the every-day work of the University.

The letter of the Government of India embodying their suggestions has been circulated among the Provincial Governments for their opinions. I have no doubt that Universities and the various recognized Associations of the country will be consulted. The educated community throughout India will watch the further progress of this controversy with the keenest interest. To them the issues raised are of supreme importance. The whole of their future might be said to be at stake. Are they to have their present educational system strengthened, invigorated and adapted to modern requirements, combining height with surface, the steady expansion of the educational area with the gradual advancement of learning, or are they to have an emasculated system, shorn of the principle of growth and expansion, confined to an infinitesimal section of the people, without influence on the life of the community and without power to mould it for the highest purposes of human progress? We have made our choice—we have proclaimed it with all the emphasis that we could command—and the latest official pronouncement seems to convey the assurance that the sympathies of the Government of India are with us.

THE ECONOMIC PROBLEM

Next in importance to the educational problem is the question of the economic condition of the people. The

educational problem does not usually occupy a large place in our discussions in this Congress. Not that its importance is overlooked, but we are content to rely with implicit confidence upon the slow and steady expansion of those educational efforts which has never been interrupted and which form a permanent feature of British policy in India. Circumstances, to which I have already referred, have given to the educational problem the prominence which it now possesses. But the statesmanlike attitude of the Viceroy gives us the assurance that the grave issues which have been raised will be settled ere long, and they will be settled in a manner which will reconcile conflicting schools and divergent interests and ensure the diffusion as well as the advancement of learning. The economic problem is a more contentious one and affords ground for wider differences of opinion, coloured, I am afraid, by official and party bias. There we enter upon an altogether more difficult sphere, where the atmosphere is surcharged with the heat of partisan controversy and where the combatants have already taken up definite sides, to which they are attached by interests and passions which must seriously interfere with the impartial consideration of the problem. On the one hand, we have the Government and the adherents of the Government, who, jubilant over the fat surpluses of the last few years, invite an admiring world to congratulate them on their work. On the other, we have Mr. Digby and his friends who shake their heads in stolid incredulity and producing their facts and figures from official sources, challenge the optimism of the opposite school. They maintain, not upon "a plausible syllogistic formula" (whatever that may mean), but upon data supplied by official authority that India has undergone steady material retrogression under British Rule, and they appeal to the Secretary of State for "a searching examination" of their position. Your President is not called upon to act as an arbiter in this controversy. He does not, indeed, feel himself qualified for the task. He has responsibilities sufficiently grave to think of adding one more to them. But the controversy is one in which this Congress must feel the deepest interest. Is it the case—we ask—that the country

is getting poorer day by day? The question is so momentous that Lord George Hamilton was forced to admit that if it should be answered in the affirmative, British Rule must stand self-condemned and Britain must be relieved of her Imperial responsibilities in relation to India. I am not prepared to admit the soundness of the inference which the Secretary of State derives, as necessarily following from the acceptance of the position of the pessimist school. Admitting that there has been steady material retrogression under British Rule, it would involve the condemnation of the policy which has hitherto been followed in the government of this country—it would be a plea, not for the severance of British connection, but rather the strengthening of it by a new bond—by the inauguration of a beneficent departure which has been insisted on by some of the greatest of Anglo-Indian administrators, by men like Munro and Bentinck and Elphinstone, and the soundness of which, at least, in theory, has never been disputed. The pessimist school, I use the term in no offensive sense, do not indeed call for the withdrawal of British overrule, but for the reversal of that policy which has impoverished the country and has been attended with disastrous economic results. India is under British Rule, and they insist upon a policy which, in its spirit and in its temper, in its sacred regard for justice and fair play, in its deep anxiety for the extension of British freedom along with the British flag, should be truly reflective of the beneficence of British greatness. It is no exaggeration to say that behind the economic controversy lies veiled the entire problem of Indian administration. Is the country to be governed for the benefit of the people, for the development of their industries, the accumulation and the husbanding of their resources, or is it to be administered in accordance with those principles which have brought about the terrible impoverishment of the people and all that it implies? Thus with the economic problem lie wrapped up the gravest administrative issues.

Is the country getting poorer day by day? The question can be set at rest by an open enquiry, started

under the auspices of the Government. Why is not such an enquiry held? Ours, indeed, has been a Government of Commissions and Committees. We have had Commissions of all sorts. One more Commission to enquire into the economic condition of the country would not seriously aggravate the situation or dislocate the administrative machinery. The Famine Union in England, which include public men of all parties and which have an economic rather than a political object in view, have been pressing for an enquiry into some typical villages. It is in no hostile spirit that they approach this question. Their object is not to find fault, but to get at the truth. The Union desire an answer to the question, whether it is true that the cultivator has been sinking deeper and deeper into poverty during recent years. But the Government will not give an answer. The Government will not hold an enquiry. Why does the Government decline to institute an enquiry for the settlement of what may justly be regarded as the problem of problems? Has it any reasons to believe that such an enquiry would be fatal to its optimistic creed? It cannot, indeed, be said that the Government is without any information on the subject, or that it ignores the gravity of the problem. On two separate occasions it held two separate and confidential enquiries. There was an enquiry held in 1880-81 by Lord Ripon. Sir David Barbour was entrusted with it. There was again an enquiry held during the Viceroyalty of Lord Dufferin. Now these enquiries either prove or disprove the allegation that the country is becoming poorer under British Rule. If they disprove the allegation, nothing would be more natural than that the rulers of India should hasten, by their publication, to refute a charge which involves so serious a reflection upon their own administration. If these enquiries do not disprove the charge, nothing would be more natural than that they should keep back the evidence, of which they are in possession. To withhold from the public the results of these enquiries, and the evidence on which they are based, raises a presumption against the roseate view of the economic situation. The presumption is strengthened by the steady refusal to hold an open

enquiry, and it assumes more or less the complexion of definite proof, in view of facts the significance of which cannot be overlooked.

FAMINES

The great, broad fact of recurring famines which grew in frequency and intensity during the last quarter of the last century stands out in striking prominence as the infallible index which powerfully appeals to the popular imagination of the growing impoverishment of the people. The story is a dismal one. By a moderate calculation the famines of 1877 and 1878, of 1889 and 1892, of 1897 and 1900 have carried off fifteen millions of people. Another calculation estimates the mortality at 26 millions. If this terrible mortality had taken place in any European country, the conscience of mankind would have received a shock from which it would not have recovered, until the means to prevent so fearful a calamity had been found and applied. If the Mahomedan Rulers of European-Turkey had permitted such a record of mortality to swell, and that from a preventible cause, in any of the European Provinces subject to their rule, their expulsion from Europe bag and baggage would have been insisted upon with passionate vehemence, and no punishment would have been deemed too great for them. But India is beyond the pale of civilized opinion, and her calamities do not apparently stir the conscience of even the great nation into whose hands her destinies have been consigned by an All-wise Providence. But the record of our famine mortality is even gloomier than what the above figures imply. Let us, for the purposes of this enquiry, divide the century into four periods of 25 years each. During the first period there were five famines with an estimated mortality of one million. During the second period, there were two famines with an estimated mortality of 500,000. In the third period, there were six famines with a recorded mortality of five millions; and as we come to the fourth and the last period, we notice the increasing gravity of the situation and the terribly high record of mortality. There were eighteen famines during this period with an

estimated mortality of twenty-six millions; and the last famine of the last quarter of the expiring century was, in the words of so high an authority as the Viceroy himself, the severest that the country had ever known. It will thus be seen that famine was an ever-constant calamity during the whole of the century, that it counted its victims by millions and that as the century drew near to its close, it became more frequent in its recurrence and more severe in its incidence. Will anybody explain to me why the famines of the last half of the century were severer and more frequent than those of the first half—why the famines of the last quarter were severer and more frequent than those of the preceding quarters—and why the last famine of the last year of the expiring century was the severest of them all? Do they not point to the growing impoverishment of the people? Let alone the carefully-drawn calculations, determining the income per head of the population which, though based upon official figures, the Secretary of State now repudiates as conjectural. Is it possible to overlook the significance of these famines, with their increasing severity and frequency and the silent but conclusive testimony which they bear to the material retrogression of the people? The public have not the time to verify intricate calculations, and they cannot be expected to follow the writer on Indian economics through the mazes of his figures, but these famines with their ever-increasing severity and recurrence leave a most painful impression on the public mind, and point, with convincing force, to the soundness of the position of those who hold that the country is steadily retrograding in material prosperity.

But we are told that famines are due to drought; to the operation of natural causes, and Governments and human institutions are powerless to avert them. We ask—is drought confined to India? Nature is impartial in her dispensations—in the distribution of her favours and disfavours. Other countries suffer from drought; but they do not suffer from famine. We must, therefore, look deeper for the causes of Indian famine.

Drought alone will not account for it. Destitution is the root-cause of Indian famine. If the people were comparatively prosperous, if they did not suffer from chronic poverty, they would, in the event of a local failure of crops, make their purchases in the markets of the neighbouring provinces, or they would have a reserve stock upon which they might fall back. But they are absolutely resourceless, sunk in the deepest depths of poverty, living from hand to mouth, often starving upon one meal a day, and they die in their thousands and hundreds of thousands upon the first stress of scarcity, and as the situation deepens, they die in their millions and tens of millions despite the efforts of a benevolent Government to save them.

Nor will it avail to seek for an explanation of Indian poverty in the increase of our population or in the spendthrift habits of our people. The census returns of 1901 disclose the fact that practically there has been no increase of population and that the increase in certain areas has been counterbalanced by decrease in other parts of the country. It is a well ascertained fact that the population has not increased in India at the rate it has done in England and some other European countries. As for the alleged spendthrift habits of the people, I will say this—that there is not a more abstemious or a more frugal race of people on earth than the peasantry of India. Their sobriety, their strong family affections, their deep concern for their children are the best preservatives of those thrifty habits which are all the more assured when they have their roots in impulse rather than in interest and when the combined operation of both impart to them an added strength. If they occasionally indulge in an extravagant *sradh* or an expensive marriage, they live from day to day, from month to month and through the recurring years with a rigid parsimony which is but the reflex of their ascetic instincts. Have they not thus lived in the ages past and gone? Empires have come and gone; dynasties have been overthrown; the face of external nature itself has been changed, but the deep-seated habits of our people have remained the same—unchanged

and unchangeable amid the vicissitudes of time and fortune. But they were not thus famine-stricken in those days, despite their expensive marriages and *sradhs*. Why are they famine-stricken now? Oh no—this theory of the alleged extravagance of the Indian peasantry will not do. It will not stand the test of scrutiny. Upon a closer examination, it disappears like baseless fabric of a vision.

The effect of recent currency legislation has been still further to depreciate the condition of the agricultural classes. I am not here discussing its general effect and with adequate regard for all interests; but the artificial fixity of the exchange has entailed heavy loss on cultivators. The extent of this loss can be calculated with some approximation to facts. The value of the raw produce of the soil, such as grain and pulse, seeds, raw jute and cotton, the proceeds of which directly benefit the cultivators, was in 1901-2, Rs. 61·30 crores (p. 10 of Mr. O'Connor's "Review of Trade"). The equivalent of this at 1s. 4d. per rupee is £40,860,000 which is paid by the importers. If the exchange value of the rupee were 1s. 2d. at the present day, the cultivators would have received, as the equivalent of this sterling amount, Rs. 70,04,57,000 or Rs. 8,74,57,000 more than what they now receive. The cultivators therefore annually incur a loss of about 8¾ crores as the result of the recent currency operations.

The tale of India's growing poverty does not, indeed, rest upon any syllogistic formula, or upon calculations which, though made from official sources, are now repudiated by official authority—it is supported by facts, the significance of which it is impossible to overlook, and by the testimony of high authorities, official and non-official. What explanation is there of the fact that, in 1886-87, the consumption of salt per head of the population was 13·9 lbs. and that, in 1899-1900, the consumption had gone down and was 12·7 lbs. per head of the population? How again do you explain the shrinking of the deposits in the Postal Savings Banks which, in 1899-90, amounted to Rs. 164, and, in 1899-90, to Rs. 125 per head of the population? Do not these facts bear eloquent testimony to the steady

material retrogression of the people? The evidence of competent authorities is equally conclusive on the subject. I will make three extracts from a Government Resolution, dated the 19th October 1888, which will throw considerable light on the economic condition of the people in some of the great provinces in India:—

BEHAR.—The picture which I have drawn does not, however, show any great prosperity, and shows that the lower classes, which, including the weaving class amounting to 25 per cent. of the population, have little chance of improving their position and that they would have no resources to fall back upon in times of scarcity... The conclusion to be drawn is that of the agricultural population, a large proportion, say, 40 per cent. are insufficiently fed, to say nothing of clothing and housing. They have enough food to support life and to enable them to work; but they have to undergo long fasts, having for a considerable part of the year to satisfy themselves with one full meal in the day.

NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES.—The Commissioner of Allahabad remarks in a general way that there is very little between the poorer classes of the people and semi-starvation; and the Collector of Banda writes that a very large number of the lower classes of the population clearly demonstrate by their poor physique that either they are habitually half-starved or have been in their early years exposed to the trials and severities of a famine.

Mr. Holderness, writing of the Pilibhit District, says that the landless labourer's condition is not all that could be desired. The united earnings of a man, his wife and two children cannot be put at more than Rs. 3 per month. When prices of food-grains are moderate, work regular, and the health of the household good, this income will enable their family to have one good meal a day, to keep a thatched roof over their head, to buy cheap cotton clothing and occasionally a thin blanket. The small cultivator is slightly better off, but he has not always enough to eat, or sufficiently warm clothes.

BOMBAY.—Poverty amongst the labouring classes of the mofussil most certainly exists, but not only does it exist, but represents the normal condition of these classes. Their houses are poor, their belongings are poor, their food is poor, their clothing *very* poor. 'Poverty,' however, and 'want,' at any rate, in India are two very different things, and after many years' residence amongst the people of the country, I have no hesitation in saying that while poverty is the rule (I still speak of the lower classes) actual want is the exception.

CENTRAL PROVINCES.—Mr. Tawney shows that the ordinary cost of food for a man, his wife and one child is 7½ pice a day

and if broken rice (*kanki*) be substituted for rice, the cost can be reduced to $4\frac{1}{2}$ pice a day. This sum will provide the family with $2\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. of grain and a small quantity of pulse, leaving $1\frac{1}{2}$ pice over for salt, vegetables and firewood. Mr. Mackenzie's general conclusion on the whole enquiry is that—"there is no doubt in these provinces a great deal of poverty, but there is very little distress. The people are well-fed, and the only section of them who can be said to be hard pressed for bare subsistence are the hill tribes, who are but little more provident than the beasts of the forests and have to undergo similar vicissitudes in daily food.

These extracts are remarkable. They throw a flood of light upon the economic condition of the people. It is no critic of the Government, but the Government and the officers of Government who speak. And what do they say? In Behar, 40 per cent. of the people are insufficiently fed. They have to undergo long fasts and for a considerable part of the year have to satisfy themselves with one full meal in the day. In the Allahabad Division, says the Commissioner, "there is very little between the poorer classes of the people and semi-starvation". In Bombay, poverty amongst the labouring classes is their normal condition. As regards the Central Provinces, we are told on the authority of Mr. Mackenzie, Chief Commissioner, than whom there was not a greater optimist in financial matters, that there is a great deal of poverty, though very little distress. This was the state of things in 1888. Has there been any improvement since then? There has been no change for the better. On the contrary, the economic condition of the people has become much worse, seeing that since then Bombay and the Central Provinces have passed through famines, which have been described as the severest of the century, and the North-Western Provinces have suffered from wide-spread distress. Having regard to the appalling poverty of the people, as disclosed in the Resolution of Government from which I have quoted, it was only to be expected that they would succumb on the first appearance of scarcity, and it is no wonder that they died in their millions when they were overwhelmed by the greatest famine of the century. Their poverty added to the intensity of the famine-conditions and swelled the record of famine mortality. As

the century expires, the picture becomes even deeper in its sombre hue. The Famine Commission of 1901 say in their Report :

On the extent of the indebtedness of the Bombay cultivators, no precise official information, we believe, exists ; but there are materials for a probable estimate. We know that the Deccan Ryots Commission of 1876 found that "about $\frac{1}{3}$ of the occupants of Government land are embarrassed with debt ; that their debts average about 18 times their assessment ; and that nearly $\frac{2}{3}$ of the debt is secured by mortgage of the land". We also know that the money-lenders, in the villages visited by the Commission, paid about $\frac{1}{6}$ th of the whole land-revenue—their property having been acquired within the preceding 20, and for the most part the preceding 10 years—while it was notorious that the private transfers of land were, in most cases, not recorded. The Commission of 1891 found that within the preceding 8 years, land paying 10 per cent of the revenue in the districts which they visited had been sold, two-fifths going to the money-lenders ; while lands paying $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the revenue had been mortgaged, four-seventh going to the *sowcars*. In his evidence before us, the Chief Secretary to the Bombay Government said that 28 per cent. of the land in Broach had passed into the possession of the money-lending classes ; and from a report of the Collector of Ahmedabad, it appears that in his district expropriation of the old owners has also made considerable way. Taking all these statements in account, and comparing them with the evidence we have recorded, we think it probable that at least $\frac{1}{4}$ th of the cultivators in the Bombay Presidency have lost possession of their lands ; that less than a fifth are free from debt ; and that the remainder are indebted to a greater or less extent.

It will be seen from the above that in the opinion of the Famine Commission, and they consisted of some of the highest officers of the Government, one-fourth of the cultivators in the Bombay Presidency have lost possession of their lands, that more than four-fifths are indebted to a greater or less extent, and that only one-fifth of the population are free from debt. Non-official opinion entirely supports this dismal tale of the growing impoverishment of the people. No one will suspect the *Pioneer* of being prejudiced against the Government. Commenting on Mr. Grierson's statement regarding the economic condition of the various sections of the population in Gaya, the *Pioneer* remarks :

Briefly, it is that all the persons of the labouring classes and ten per cent. of the cultivating and artisan classes, or forty-five per cent. of the total population are insufficiently clothed, or insufficiently fed, or both. In Gaya district this would give about a million persons without sufficient means of support. If we assume that the circumstances of Gaya are not exceptional—and there is no reason for thinking otherwise—it follows that nearly one hundred millions of people in British India are living in extreme poverty.

Thus, according to one of the accredited organs of Anglo-Indian opinion which often is the exponent of official policy and measures, and is generally their staunch supporter, nearly one hundred millions of people in India are living in extreme poverty. This was said in 1893 ; in 1901, an Indian publicist of great experience and knowledge, describing the state of things in India, says : “ The poverty and suffering of the people are such as to defy description. In fact, for nearly 15 years there has been a continuous famine in India.” Is it necessary to produce further evidence in support of the growing impoverishment of the country ? Lord George Hamilton himself says that India “ is poor—very, very poor”. If this is the official admission, we have a right to expect that it shall be followed by corresponding official action. Statesmanship can address itself to no higher function. It has not more sacred calling than the devising of measures which would reclaim a great people from the depths of poverty, and the physical misery and the intellectual and moral degradation which follow in its train. And if it is true that the greatness of the British Empire, the position of England among the nations of the Earth, is largely due to her Indian overlordship, then the obligation to save India from her present critical situation assumes the character of a great national duty—of a truly Imperial function—emphasised by considerations of mutual interest and the consciousness of past obligations. We desire to co-operate with the Government in the performance of this duty. We wish to associate ourselves with the rulers of India as co-adjustors, if they will accept our help in the spirit in which it is offered. For we feel that in this matter the Government needs aid and is entitled to the sympathetic

co-operation of the community. It is in this spirit and with no desire to criticise and to find fault, that we would venture to suggest some remedial measures which the Government may with advantage adopt. The situation is so grave that the adoption of these measures can no longer be postponed with safety to the best interests of the country. Let not the words "too late" be written upon British policy in India. As in the case of the stricken-down patient, so in the case of the afflicted country, there comes a time when remedial measures, however promising, may be too late to be applied with advantage. In the physical as well as in the moral world, Nature takes her revenge upon the dilatory who neglect their opportunities or misread her clear unerring intimations. The remedial measures which should be adopted in view of the steady material retrogression of the country may be summarized as follows :—

(1) The revival of our old industries and the creation of new ones; (2) the moderate assessment of the land tax; (3) the remission of taxes which press heavily upon the poor; (4) the stoppage of the drain and the adoption of the necessary administrative measures in that behalf.

THE INDUSTRIES

All will admit that the expansion of agriculture at the expense of manufacturing industry is a serious economic evil, for which, so far as it prevails in British India, British Rule is largely responsible.

No one who considers the economic condition of India, said Lord Dufferin, at the opening of the Exhibition of Industrial Arts in Calcutta, can doubt that one of its greatest evils is to be found in the fact that the great mass of the people of the country are dependent almost exclusively on the cultivation of the soil.

This was not the state of things in the past. It was the manufactures of India which drew European nations to the shores of India. The European traders were first attracted, not by our raw produce, but by our manufactured ware. The fame of the fine muslins of Bengal,

their rich silks and brocades had spread far and wide in Asia as well as in Europe. Where are they now? They have practically disappeared.

The arts of spinning and weaving, says Sir Henry Cotton, which for ages afforded employment to a numerous and industrious population, have now become extinct. Families which formerly were in a state of affluence, have been reduced to penury.

There is no class of men, exclaims Sir James Caird, whom our rule has pressed harder upon than the Indian weaver and artisan.

What was it that brought about the extinction of our manufactures? What destructive force was in operation to produce this dire result? I will not answer the question myself, but will allow an Englishman to speak; and he shall be no other than the distinguished Orientalist, whose knowledge of Eastern countries in general, and of India in particular, was so unique.

The British manufacturer, said Horace Hayman Wilson, employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms.

It was the fixed policy of the British Government and of the East India Company, in the early days of British Rule, to discourage Indian manufacture and so encourage the growth of Indian raw produce.

This policy, says Mr. Dutt, in his "Economic History of British India," was followed with unwavering resolution and fatal success. Orders were sent out to force Indian artisans to work in the company's factories; commercial residents were legally vested with extensive powers over villages and communities of weavers. Prohibitive tariffs excluded Indian silk and cotton goods from England. English goods were admitted into India free of duty, or on payment of nominal duty.

These measures produced a disastrous effect on Indian manufactures. Let us look at the figures. In 1794, India imported from England only £156 worth of cotton goods; in 1800, the imports had swelled to £19,595; in 1806, they had increased to £48,525; and in 1812, to £107,306. Cotton goods and silk goods were the national manufactures of India. They were subjected to a heavy tariff. British cotton goods paid a duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on being

imported into India, Indian cotton goods paid a duty of 10 per cent. on being imported into England. British silk goods paid an import duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in India; Indian silk goods paid an import duty of 20 per cent. in England. This was the state of things in 1840. Our cotton manufactures had then practically died out. The import of Indian goods into England had dwindled to one-fourth in twenty-one years (from 1814 to 1835) from 12 lakhs of pieces to 3 lakhs of pieces, while the import of British cotton goods into India had increased fifty times within the same period, viz., from less than a million yards to over fifty million yards. But Indian silk goods still maintained their footing, and though heavily weighted carried on an unequal competition. But even this was not to be. In vain did Mr. Larpent, Chairman of the East India Company, plead in his evidence before the Select Committee of 1840 for the reduction of the duty on silk goods to save it from the fate which had overtaken Indian cotton goods. It had been the settled policy of England in India, ever since her rise in political power, to convert India into a land of raw produce for the benefit of the manufacturers and operatives of England. And one of the members of the Select Committee, Mr. Brocklehurst, openly avowed this policy when he said :—

It would be more desirable perhaps that India should produce the raw material, and this country show its skill in perfecting that raw material.

The course of things in India, replied Mr Larpent, is leading to that. . . . But I submit that as this is *the last of the expiring manufactures of India*, the only one where there is a chance of introducing the native manufactures, at least let it have a fair chance.

The chance was not given. British silk goods and Indian silk goods were both imported into France. In fair and open competition, the Indian silk goods commanded a wider sale at the French market. The jealous susceptibilities of the British manufacturers were roused. The importation of Indian silk goods into France was prohibited, "and British goods had in consequence a preference with French buyers". But as soon as the

prohibition was taken off, the British trade to France was practically annihilated. This was too much for the British manufacturers. They would not stand it. They were resolved to drive Indian silk goods from the only foreign market that was open to them. The prohibition was renewed, and the last of the expiring manufactures of India was crushed out of existence. Could there be a more melancholy tale of unfeeling selfishness and cruel injustice which destroyed our manufactures and drove the great mass of our population upon the soil, to wring from it a bare subsistence when they could and to die in their millions when they could not. I am free to admit that the application of steam to the development of manufactures completed the downfall of our industries. But selfishness rather than science is responsible for our industrial ruin. Can it even now be said that this policy has received its last *quietus*, with the growth of progressive and Imperial ideas and the closer relationship between the two countries? The old jealousy is still dominant in the counsels of our rulers. Or else how are we to account for the excise duty levied upon Indian cotton fabrics, which handicaps them in competition with other countries? Is it too much to hope that the Delhi Durbar will mark the inauguration of a new era of equal justice pervading every branch of the administration? Are we not, indeed, entitled to this paltry boon of equal justice, seeing how greatly indebted England is to India for her commercial and industrial expansion? Not to speak of the market which India offers for English goods, it is Indian wealth which, towards the close of the eighteenth century, communicated an extraordinary impulse to the growth and development of British commerce and manufactures. Thus, writes Mr. Brooks Adams in his "Law of Civilization and Decay", a book written with no political object in view :—

The influx of the Indian treasure, by adding considerably to the nation's cash capital, not only increased its stock of energy, but added much to its flexibility and the rapidity of its movement.

Plassey was fought in 1757, and probably nothing has ever equalled the rapidity of the change which followed. In 1760, the

flying-shuttle appeared, and coal began to replace wood in smelting. In 1764, Hargreaves invented the spinning-jenny; in 1779, Crompton contrived the mule; in 1785, Cartwright patented the power-loom, and chief of all, in 1768, Watt matured the steam engine, the most perfect of all vents of centralising energy. But though these machines served as outlets for the accelerating movement of the time, they did not cause that acceleration. In themselves inventions are passive, many of the most important having lain dormant for centuries, waiting for a sufficient store of force to have accumulated to set them working. That store must always take the shape of money, and money not hoarded, but in motion.

From 1694 to Plassey, the growth had been relatively slow. For more than sixty years after the foundation of the Bank of England its smallest note had been for £20, a note too large to circulate freely, and which rarely travelled far from Lombard Street. Writing in 1790, Burke mentioned that when he came to England in 1750, there were not "twelve bankers' shops" in the provinces though then, he said, they were in every market town. Thus, the arrival of the Bengal silver not only increased the mass of money but stimulated its movement; for at once, in 1759, the bank issued £10 and £15 notes, and in the country private firms poured forth a flood of paper.

Having regard to the past policy of the Government, we feel that we are entitled, both by reason of that policy (for wrong must be redressed) and the substantial help which England derived from India in establishing her industrial pre-eminence, to claim a sympathetic treatment of the industrial problem. England destroyed our manufactures by prohibitive tariffs and by the pursuit of an industrial policy, which all fair-minded Englishmen must condemn. England has benefited enormously from Indian wealth and commerce. Will she not lend us a helping hand and co-operate with us in the blessed task of working out our industrial salvation? If we had a potential voice in the government of our country, there would be no question as to what policy we should follow. We would unhesitatingly adopt a policy of protection. That was, indeed, the policy of England before her industries attained their maturity. England reared her manufacturing power by protection; and then she turned a free-trader and invited other nations to accept free-trade principles. The other nations, including the British Colonies, knew

better, and are now rearing their manufacturing power by protection.

But in India, says Mr. Dutt, the manufacturing power of the people was stamped out by protection against her industries; and then free-trade was forced on her to prevent a revival.

But we fear protection is out of the question. May we not at least hope for a fair and equitable treatment of our industries, without reference to other interests than our own and without their being handicapped by duties, which must interfere with their expansion? We have heard a great deal in these days about State-encouragement of our arts and industries—about technical institutes which are to minister to our industries. But where is the technical institute maintained by Government which serves this great purpose? The mining industry in Bengal has made great progress. A mining college would be serviceable to the industry. The proposal was actually made last year in Congress. But the Government as yet shows no signs of moving in the matter. There is a proposal to organize a commercial department. Will it help the national industries and guide them along a beneficent channel? Will it call forth and develop a spirit of enterprise among our people? We know not—but this we do know that we have a solemn duty in this matter. We have a high commission which we cannot ignore. As the guides and the instructors of our people, we have to tell them what is best for them. If the Government will not listen to our appeals, they, at any rate, will not turn a deaf ear to our words of counsel and advice; and we desire to tell them in all seriousness and with all the emphasis that we can command that, if they wish well to themselves and to their country, they must turn their thoughts to commercial enterprise and the development of the marvellous resources of their country. The bread-problem is the problem of problems and must be solved. The professions are crowded. The services cannot provide a place for all of us. Agriculture will not save our people from the terrible visitations of famine. The masses are starving, and when famine comes, they die in their millions;

the middle classes are carrying on an arduous struggle to maintain body and soul together. Everywhere poverty and destitution stare us in the face. What is to be the solution? The gorgeous India was the fable land of wealth. Are we alone to be excluded from the rich treasures of untold wealth, which our Mother-earth shelters in her bosom and which she has sheltered through the ages past, so that her children in their own good time may reap the fruits thereof? Who has ever been deprived of a mother's choicest gifts? If the country is to be saved, we must leave the beaten track of the services and the professions, and be the pioneers and organizers of a vast industrial movement, which will secure to us the possession of that wealth which Nature has ordained for us, and which, when so secured, will lead to the final and the satisfactory solution of the industrial problem. Let us guide the public mind of India along this beneficent channel.

THE LAND REVENUE ASSESSMENT

In an agricultural country the land tax is necessarily a question of great importance. The success of agricultural operations largely depends upon fixity of tenure and fixity of assessment—upon the assurance given to the cultivator that he will be permitted to enjoy the fruits of his labour and his improvements. It is the Permanent Settlement which lies at the root of the great prosperity of Bengal, and if we cannot have a permanent settlement in other parts of India, we should at least have a moderate land tax fixed for a reasonably long period. The question has been the subject of keen controversy and has elicited an authoritative pronouncement from the Government of India. In non-permanently settled estates, where the land tax is paid by the landlord, Lord Curzon has practically limited the State demand to one-half the actual rent; but where the land tax is paid by the cultivator, no clear limitation of this kind has been imposed. Nor does Lord Curzon accept the principle of Lord Ripon's Government, that an enhancement of the State demand at periodical revisions is only to take place when there has been a rise in the price of crops. In the older Provinces, His Excellency

would fix thirty years as the limit during which an assessment would be in force. Some of these concessions are in accordance with the Memorial which was submitted to the Secretary of State, on 20th December 1900, by some distinguished men who had long served Government in high and responsible offices. Among the signatories were: Sir Richard Garth, Sir John Jardine, Mr. Garstin, Mr. Reynolds, Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. R. C. Dutt. They advocated, among other things, that where the land revenue is paid directly by the cultivators, as in most parts of Madras and Bombay, the Government demand should be limited to 50 per cent. of the value of the net produce, after deducting charges of cultivation. They recommended that a limit should be fixed in each province beyond which it may not be possible to surcharge the land tax with local cesses. These local cesses, I understand, are a heavy burden on landlords in the North-Western Provinces. I fear that in the existing state of official opinion it is impossible for us to obtain a permanent settlement for all India, however much we may wish it and however much we may be justified in making such a demand, having regard to the past pledges of the Government. Three Governors-General under the East India Company, three Viceroy's under the Crown, men like Lord Canning, Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon, exerted their great influence with a view to impose a permanent limitation on the land tax in India. But they were overruled by the authorities in England. It is not likely that any appeal, which we might make for the extension of the Permanent Settlement, would command greater attention. But a moderate land tax, fixed for a reasonably long period, is absolutely essential to the prosperity of our agricultural population, and we must insist upon it, in season and out of season, alike in the interests of the Government and of the people; and it seems to me that the wisest course for us to follow would be to take our stand upon the Memorial of the distinguished men, to which I have referred, and appeal to the Government for the very moderate concessions which they suggest. Such an appeal,

urged with moderation and persistency, is bound to bear fruit even in the near future.

REMISSION OF TAXATION

Among the remedial measures which I have suggested is the remission of taxation. An unanswerable case was made out in its favour by Mr. Gokhale in his budget speech, which has won for him the gratitude and the admiration of his countrymen. An overflowing treasury with a starving population is an anomaly which will strike every one. The conclusion is inevitable that more is taken from the taxpayer than what may fairly be required of him, and when the taxpayer, as he usually is in India, is the starving ryot, the remission of taxation becomes a matter of paramount obligation on the part of the rulers of the land. For many long years we have patiently submitted to a heavy burden ; and now that since 1898-99, despite frontier wars and heavy famine expenditure, we have had years of uninterrupted surpluses, we are entitled to look forward to the remission of taxation. Since 1884-85 we have had a number of new taxes imposed upon us, yielding, roughly speaking, an annual revenue of 9 crores of rupees. Since 1884-85, we have had 12 years of surpluses amounting to over 28 crores, and 7 years of deficits amounting to about 14½ crores, and since 1898-99, our surpluses have not been interrupted. Thanks to the statesmanlike policy of Lord Curzon, the prospects of peace on the frontiers have become more assured, and thanks to the bounty of Nature which has been somewhat deferred, the grim spectre of famine does not darken the view. The currency has been steadied, though by the adoption of a policy which has given rise to serious differences of opinion, and the fluctuating rupee no longer frightens the rulers of India or robs them of their peace. From all sides therefore we have indications which justify the hope—the very reasonable hope—that the strain on our finances is at an end and that our surpluses will be continued (leave alone the question as to whether they have been under-estimated or not). May we not, therefore, plead for relief—for the mitigation

of that burden which has pressed upon us so heavily and must press with crushing weight upon our starving peasantry? We are grateful for the remission of the arrears of land-revenue in the famine-stricken areas. But it is not enough; it does not go to the root of the matter. What is wanted is not temporary alleviation, but permanent relief. If the Government, for the benefit of its European servants, could initiate a policy of granting exchange compensation allowance at a time of deficit—if, in 1893-94, it could pay 62 lakhs of rupees* as exchange compensation allowance when its deficit was a crore and a half—the Government might surely, for the benefit of a half-famished people, remit taxes which press heavily upon them, and at a time when it has a large surplus and when it may be reasonably hoped that its financial embarrassments are at an end.

I have heard a great deal about India being most lightly-taxed country in the world. Even in the domain of romance there is not a prettier picture, but the illusion quickly disappears when the searchlight of scrutiny is turned upon it, when the stern and grim figures which reveal their own tale are marshalled in their proper places and are permitted to bear their silent but eloquent testimony. Lawyers say that circumstances cannot lie. The financier says that figures are even more veracious witnesses.

* EXCHANGE COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE

EXPENDITURE ON EXCHANGE ALLOWANCE SINCE 1893-94

Rs.		Rs	
1893-64	... 62,44,110	1898-99	... 48,59,430
1894-95	... 1,24,95,910	1899-1900	... 48,29,370
1895-96	... 1,33,81,630	1900-1	... 46,00,930
1896-97	... 94,38,250	1901-2	} ... Figures not available. ... but 46 lakhs may be taken for each year or 92 lakhs in all.
1897-98	... 69,39,740	1902-3	

The deficit of the year 1893-94, when the E. C. A. was granted, was Rs 1,54,70,000, of which Rs. 62,44,110 was due to E. C. A. The ordinary deficit which would have occurred, if E. C. A. was not granted, was Rs. 92,26,000 in round numbers. This deficit was anticipated at the time when the E. C. A. was recommended by the

Let us for a moment turn to the testimony of figures. In India, the total pressure of taxation is about 85 crores† which distributed among a population of 232 millions gives an incidence of Rs. 3-10-6 per head, or a percentage of 12·29 on the average income. The total taxation income in the United Kingdom, in 1898-99 (the normal year before the War) was 90 millions sterling. The population being 41½ millions, the incidence of taxation is £2-3s. per head. Now the average income per head is £36, and the pressure of taxation on the income of an Englishman is therefore only 6 per cent. against 12·2 per cent. in the case of the native of India. These figures disprove the oft-repeated declaration of the Government

Government of India to the Secretary of State, as the following extract from a Despatch will show:—

We have considered carefully the effect of granting these concessions upon our financial position. Apart from the expenditure now proposed (*i.e.*, expenditure on E. C. A.) the deficit of the year will amount to 57 lakhs. Including the costs of giving effect to our present recommendations, the total deficit will, therefore, amount to 100 lakhs. This deficit we propose to accept *without taking any special steps to meet it*. We have not overlooked the very grave objections to accepting, and more especially to adding to, the deficit of the current year (1893-94). But after very carefully weighing all the issues involved, we have come to the conclusion that the circumstances are so special as to justify a departure from the ordinary rule of sound finance which requires that measures should be taken to remove a deficit as soon as its occurrence is seen to be probable.

(The Government of India did not take any special measure during the year to avoid the public reproach of granting E. C. A. to the high-paid officers by resorting to taxation. The deficit of the year 1893-94 was accordingly allowed to appear in the accounts. This deficit, which would have recurred with increasing effect in 1894-95 owing to the expenditure of 1¼ crores on E. C. A. against 62½ lakhs in 1893-94, was wiped off and converted into a surplus by the imposition of customs duties affecting the general mass of the population.)

† This figure is calculated on the supposition that the cultivator actually pays more as land tax than what reaches the coffers of Government. This represents the pressure of land tax on the ryots which is much in excess of the total land revenue of about 30½ crores.

that "India is the most lightly-taxed country in the world". It is, of course, true that the amount of taxation *per se* is light; but if taxation means pressure on the income, India is more heavily taxed than England, or perhaps any other country in the world.

But if taxation is to be remitted, the practical question to consider is, what is the tax which should have a preferential consideration? I have no hesitation in saying that the duty on salt is the first that should be dealt with. It is one of the primary canons of taxation that the necessities of life should not be taxed. But salt is a prime necessary of life, and it is taxed. Nay more: the duty on salt has been enhanced, and when it was enhanced in 1888, Lord Cross, then Secretary of State, declared in a Despatch to the Government of India that the increase in the salt duty should be looked upon as temporary, and that no effort should be spared to reduce the general duty as speedily as possible to the former rate. Lord George Hamilton took the same view of the matter in his budget speech in the House of Common in 1895, when he emphasized the necessity of reducing the salt duty as early as possible. Lord George Hamilton, in his recent speech on the budget in the House of Commons, expressed the opinion that it was the enhanced duty which interfered with the consumption of salt. The reduction of the duty, therefore, is an obligation which the rulers of the land cannot ignore.

I find that an agitation has been set on foot for the total repeal of the income tax. I cannot say that I am in sympathy with this agitation. In a general scheme for the remission of taxes, the salt tax must have the first place; and if the Government is able to proceed still further with the reduction of taxation, the minimum of taxable income for the income tax should be raised. The minimum is now fixed at the sum of 500 rupees a year. It should be raised to 1,000 rupees a year, or if you like, to a still higher figure. The poor man must claim our first consideration, not because he is a poor man, but because the measure of sacrifice must be even, and society has no right to call upon

him to make a heavier sacrifice for the general purposes of the State than what is required of the rich man. The necessities of life and the income necessary for the bare maintenance of the bread-winner and his family must be relieved of all taxation. In England, the minimum of taxable income is £150 a year. The requirements of the Englishman are no doubt more numerous; his standard of living is higher. But, on the other hand, it is to be borne in mind that the Englishman lives for himself and his wife and children; whereas the Indian, under the operation of the joint-family system, has a large number of relatives to feed and support. In any case I trust the minimum of taxable income will be raised.

In this connection I desire to call the attention of the Government to a special appropriation of the income tax, which was made when the income tax was first levied. The income tax law of 1860 set apart one per cent. of the proceeds of the tax for expenditure locally on public works. In the five years, during which the Act was in force, the sum which accrued from this source to local public works funds amounted to £1,611,410, or 161 lakhs of rupees.*

* I cannot recommend the absolute surrender of any part of the general revenues. I regard them as all Imperial alike. . . . To this I would make only one exception, namely, that I would give up one-fourth of whatever income tax might be raised to the Local Governments for public improvement according to the principle established by Mr. James Wilson (Financial Member) in 1860.

[Sir Richard Temple's Minute, dated 7th November, 1868.]

The following is the main outline of Mr. Wilson's proposals in his own words :—

On incomes above 500 rupees we propose a tax at the rate of 3 per cent. for the public treasury and 1 per cent. to be appropriated strictly to local purposes, and in regard to the appropriation of which where municipalities exist, they will have a voice; the charge may be very small and the good to be derived from such a contribution may be very great. In the United States which boasts of the freest Government in the world, a property-tax is collected by the Government of each State, of a considerable amount, and applied in part to general and in part to local and municipal purposes.

Why should not such a course be followed now, why should the income tax be entirely merged in the general revenues of the Empire? How many useful and beneficent public works, which are now starved or are abandoned, would, if such a policy were in force, be carried out for the general benefit of the country?

The only objection that I can think of the remission of taxation is the possible increase of the military expenditure of the Empire. There are two proposals before us—one is the addition of nearly a million sterling to our military expenditure to meet the cost of the efficiency of the reformed British army in India. The other is in the nature of a suggestion thrown out by the Secretary of State in the course of his budget speech to the effect that there might be an addition to the European army in India. Against both these proposals, we ought to record our emphatic protest. Lord Curzon will not consent to the withdrawal of a single European soldier from India. But will His Excellency permit the Home Government to thrust upon the Indian taxpayer the burden of a bloated army, far in excess of his requirements? Recent events have demonstrated the fact that our army, even as now maintained, is really in excess of what the country needs, and that it is maintained on a footing which more or less serves the purpose of an Imperial reserve. We could spare 20,000 British troops for the recent military operations without risk to our interests. It is not the case of the loan of a watch-dog, as pithily put by His Excellency the Viceroy. The watch-dog was lent for such a long period and was so long absent that we did not miss him at all, and we felt that we could do without him. There cannot be the smallest objection to the location of British troops in India to serve as an Imperial Reserve; but it is only equitable that the cost should be borne by the British treasury.

I contend that the incidence of the military expenditure is heavier in India than it is in the United Kingdom, and we are therefore entitled, if not to relief, at any rate, to exemption from the imposition of further

burdens. If the taxable wealth of a country is determined by the proceeds of the income tax, then we find that for every rupee of such tax, the Government of India spends 14 Rs. upon the Army; whereas the British Government for every pound of such tax spends about £4. The total cost of the defence of India is as follows :

Army	---	---	26'50 crores
Military works	---	---	1 20 "
Marine	---	---	75 ..

Total ... Rs. 28'45 crores.

The expenditure of the United Kingdom on the Army and Navy is about 60 millions. In India, the revenue from income tax is about 2 crores of rupees. In the United Kingdom, the revenue from the income tax on the basis of a 6d. rate (corresponding to the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. rate in India) is about 15 millions. The proportion, therefore, of income tax to expenditure on the defence of the country is as 1 to 4 in the United Kingdom. In India, it is as 1 to 14. If, moreover, we deduct the greater portion of the charges for the Navy, which is maintained for the defence of the colonial possessions of the Empire, the proportion for the United Kingdom will be much less. Thus, India pays proportionately to her national wealth $3\frac{1}{2}$ times more than what the United Kingdom pays towards the cost of the country's defence.

However that may be, we ought to record our strong protest against any further expansion of our military expenditure.

Millions of money have been spent, wrote the Government of India in their Despatch of the 25th March 1890, on armament and fortification to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursion of warlike peoples of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East.

They urged that "in the maintenance of the British forces in this country, a just and even liberal view should be taken of the charges which should legitimately be made against the Indian revenues". We press the same view.

A small instalment of justice has been done by the very paltry relief which has been afforded to the Indian Exchequer by the annual grant from the British Exchequer of about £250,000 a year in accordance with the recommendations of the Welby Commission. But that is not enough, and we appeal to the Government of India to press upon the Home Government the statesmanlike views which it urged in 1890. Let it not be said that because we the people of India "have no voice in the matter", "an excessive military tribute" is demanded from us. In asking for an equitable adjustment of the military charges, we have the high authority of the Government of India behind us; and our claim founded upon the highest justice is strengthened by the magnificent services which India rendered to the Empire during the recent wars, and to which no one has borne more eloquent testimony than His Excellency the Viceroy. We appeal for financial justice, and I am sure we do not appeal in vain.

THE DRAIN

One of the chief causes which have contributed to the impoverishment of the people is the annual drain which, says a writer on Indian economics, "has tapped India's very heart-blood". Lord Salisbury has himself observed that "much of the revenue of India exported without a direct equivalent". The drain of the last thirty years of the 19th century has been estimated at £900,000,000 without interest, at the rate of £30,000,000 a year. This drain represents a distinct loss of national wealth and resources. As Sir George Wingate has observed:—

The taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in their effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. . . . In this case, they constitute no mere transfer of one portion of the national income from one set of citizens to another, but are an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount drawn from the taxed country.

What is to be the remedy? It is simple enough, if the Government will only adopt it. The revival of old and the introduction of new industries, the wider employment of the people in the higher offices of State, a

more equitable adjustment of charges between England and India in matters in which both countries are interested, would go a long way to check the drain and the material exhaustion consequent thereon. British Rule represents the Government of India by one of the most civilized nations of the world. It is a proud and glorious record. In point of culture and enlightenment and in its ideals of government, it is far removed from most Governments which preceded it. But the conquerors of old soon made the conquered country their own, and returned to the people the money which they had wrung from the people. They thus stimulated the springs of domestic industry and contributed to the material prosperity of the people. Might we not ask the English Rulers of India, whose proud mission it is to govern India for the benefit of India, to return to the people the people's wealth and thus lay broad and deep the foundations of our material prosperity?

THE REMEDY

What are to be the means for enforcing the remedial measures for checking the growing impoverishment of the country? How is economy to be enforced,—how are the taxes to be imposed without hampering the springs of industry—how are the sources of national wealth to be deepened and widened—how is agriculture to be improved and the arts and manufactures stimulated? The sovereign remedy is to be found in the practice of the British constitution. Give the people a potential voice over the control of the public expenditure, and economy will follow as surely as the night follows the day. When people spend their own money, the strongest motives of self-interest enforce economy. When they spend other people's money and are responsible only to their consciences, they soon make the discovery that they can satisfy their consciences somehow—that the divine monitor within is keenly responsive to the promptings of interest and passion—and so they grow careless and extravagant. The British constitution has recognized this truth and has embalmed it in the constitutional usage of the land. The British

constitution, one of the finest products of human wisdom and genius, has always shown the utmost solicitude to ensure to the representatives of the people and to them alone the full and absolute control over the public purse. A money bill becomes law when it has passed the House of Commons, and without reference to the House of Lords and without the assent of the Sovereign. It seems to me that the time has come when a definite, forward step should be taken towards the recognition of a similar principle in the government of India, subject to such checks as circumstances may suggest. It is worthy of consideration whether expansion of the Legislative Councils should not take place, with representatives from each District in the Local Councils, armed with the power of control over the public expenditure, and whether an expansion of the Imperial Council upon similar lines may not with advantage be introduced. It is thus and thus only will economy be ensured, the burden of taxation lightened, the material prosperity of the people stimulated, and the financial position of the Government placed upon a sound and satisfactory footing.

THE WIDER EMPLOYMENT OF OUR PEOPLE

I have referred to the question of the economic drains and from year to year we have appealed to the Government from this platform to stop it, or if, in the present relations between England and India, this cannot be done, to curtail its volume. From a return ordered by the House of Commons, it appears that the salaries, allowances and pensions to Europeans in India drawing £100 a year or more were £10,274,246 in 1889-90. It must be much more now, as exchange compensation allowance has since been added. The bulk of this vast sum of money is necessarily spent out of India. The employment of a costly foreign agency for government of a country is, in the best of circumstances, a heavy financial burden and often a financial loss; in the case of India, it is among the primary causes of her growing impoverishment. The wider employment of the people in the public service of their own country is one of the chief remedial measures which will

naturally suggest itself. Racial disqualifications have long been abolished. Merit is the sole test of qualification for public employment. This principle has again and again been affirmed; but there is as yet very wide divergence between principle and practice. The noble principle of equality affirmed by the Queen's Proclamation has been accepted with unhesitating assent by a long line of distinguished Viceroys. Lord Curzon has declared it to be the golden rule of his conduct. We have for many long years looked forward to the complete redemption of pledges, so solemnly given, by authorities so distinguished, and associated with the honoured name of a Sovereign whose memory is cherished with grateful affection by the people of India. But as yet we are far removed from this blessed consummation. The Resolution of the House of Commons of the second of June 1893, affirming the principle of simultaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Services, remains a dead letter. The appeal of the Indian Association praying for the wider employment of natives of India in the minor Civil Services has practically been rejected. The guaranteed appointments in the Rurki College are withheld from natives of India, coming from the Presidencies of Bengal, Bombay and Madras. The appointments in Cooper's Hill are no longer thrown open to the unrestricted competition of Indian candidates. We are excluded from the competitive examinations held in London for recruitment to the higher offices in the Police Service. Are not all these distinct breaches of the Queen's Proclamation, open violations of that mandate which she laid upon her Ministers by her Royal command? Those who bring about the indefinite postponement of the redemption of solemn pledges and seek to quibble away the gracious promises, enshrined in historic documents, to which the national faith is pledged, have no conception of the irreparable injury they do to the British Government in India; for, in the words of the Viceroy, addressed to the Talukdars of Oudh, it is English veracity rather than English valour or intelligence which has built up and consolidated this vast Empire. Those who shake the confidence of the people in the pledges of the Government

weaken the foundations of Imperial Rule. In the frenzy of power they may seek to trifle with the moral laws; but the mandate of the Almighty has made them paramount, and none can defy them with impunity.

As regards the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service, the prospects of Indian candidates have sensibly diminished; and well they may. The marks in Sanskrit and Arabic are 500; in Greek and Latin they are 750. Roman and Greek History, each of which carries 400 marks, Roman Law and Political Science to each of which 500 marks are attached, are subjects which Indian students may take up; but they are handicapped by the nature of the questions set. In all these subjects, extracts from the Latin and Greek authors are placed before the students, and to be able to answer them they must know these classical languages. Is a knowledge of the classical languages necessary for the thorough mastery of Political Science which is altogether a modern branch of knowledge, or even of Roman or Greek History? So many Latin and Greek passages and questions are introduced in the question papers on these subjects that I think it would be no exaggeration to say that no candidate, not knowing Latin and Greek, could hope to gain even half the maximum marks in these subjects. What is most inexcusable is the free quotation from Greek authors in the paper on Political Science. It is, therefore, practically impossible for an Indian student to take up these subjects. Thus, an English candidate has for his Latin $750 + 400$ marks and for his Greek $750 + 400$ marks, or a total of 2,300 marks against 500 marks only in Sanskrit or Arabic for the Indian student. Or, if the Indian student is exceptionally clever, he may take up both Sanskrit and Arabic, and in that case there will be his 1,000 marks against the 2,300 marks of the English candidate. But the latter's knowledge of Greek and Latin gives him an enormous advantage over the Indian candidate; for it enables him to take up Roman Law and Political Science, each of which carries 500 marks. Thus it will be seen that Indian students, whose education is not

classical, are placed at a serious disadvantage at the competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service, and I very much fear that their failure is largely due to the conditions of the examination to which I have called attention. There is no reason why Indian History, like English, Roman or Greek History, or why Persian, the most beautiful among the living languages of the East, to which modern Urdu is largely indebted for its vocabulary, should not be included among the subjects of examination? From an educational point of view, is Indian history less interesting or useful than the History of Rome or Greece—or is Persian a less effective discipline of the mind than French, German or Italian? The considerations to which I have referred call for definite action on our part. The British Committee may be invited to initiate the necessary measures in this behalf.

In regard to this question, if we have not altogether lost ground, we have, at any rate, not made much progress. For the present we are confronted with the forces of reaction, and we must bide our time. But when that time comes, and there are already signs of the bursting of the new dawn, let us bear in mind that the first duty which we owe to ourselves and to the distinguished man who has worked so long, and so unselfishly for India's welfare—India's Grand Old Man—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, is to apply ourselves to the fulfilment of the Resolution of the House of Commons with which he was so prominently associated. We must insist upon the practical affirmation of the principle of simultaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Service; and if we insist upon it in season and out of season, our rulers will, I have no doubt, yield to the importunity of our demand what they have denied to the justice of our cause. In the long and glorious history of national triumphs, I have not yet known of the failure of a cause such as ours is, based upon the highest justice and the plainest considerations of expediency; and if we do fail, the fault will be ours.

THE MILITARY SERVICE

As a part of the question of the wider employment of our people in the Public Service, it is impossible not to

refer to the exclusion of our countrymen from the commissioned ranks in the Army. The bravest native soldier, a born warrior, possessed, it may be, of military instincts which he has inherited from a long line of ancestors, cannot in these days rise beyond the rank of a Subadar-Major or a Ressaldar-Major in the British Army. The youngest British subaltern, who was not born when the veteran won his spurs, is his superior military officer, whose orders he must carry out and whose higher rank he must recognize by the tribute of the military salute. A more unnatural state of things does not perhaps prevail in any other country ; and to imagine that the proud Sikh or the intrepid Gurkha warrior does not feel the anomaly and the humiliation which it implies is to hold that he is something better or worse than human. It was not thus that Roman Rule was consolidated in the most distant part of Rome's world-wide Empire. It was not thus that the Mahomedan rulers of India established their sovereignty among hostile and alien races. It is not thus that Russia upholds her great Empire in Central Asia. Trust is the secret of successful imperial rule. Mistrust is the weapon of the weak and the suspicious, not of the brave and the generous. Caution carried to the verge of timidity is a feeble instrument of Government. A wise step has, indeed, been taken which represents a departure from the policy of the past. We desire to express our gratitude to His Excellency the Viceroy for the organization of the *Imperial Cadet Corps*. We hope it represents the inauguration of a new and beneficent policy. Might we not appeal to His Excellency to follow it up by throwing open the commissioned ranks in the Indian Army to the representatives of the military races in India and to those who, by an adequate training and test, prove their fitness for military command ? It would be a substantial recognition of their loyalty which would be more acceptable to them than all the honours which titular distinctions may confer. There is no name more honoured in Indian history than that of Henry Lawrence who died in the performance of his duty. Thus wrote Henry Lawrence in the early fifties :

If Asiatics and Africans can obtain honourable position in the armies of Russia and France, surely Indians, after a tried service of a century [under England's banner, are entitled to the same boon, nay justice.

THE SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

Among the reforms which have occupied a prominent place in our programme is the question of the separation of Judicial and Executive functions in the administration of criminal justice. We claim to have brought it within the range of practical politics, and the question is now pending for final decision by the Government of India. A Memorial was presented by Lord Hobhouse and several other distinguished men, praying for the speedy introduction of this reform. The Memorial has been forwarded to the Government of India; but no orders have yet been passed. It is with some little disappointment we notice that this question has not been included among the twelve administrative problems which Lord Curzon has selected for solution; but if it is true that justice is the bulwark of Thrones and States, then there can be no more urgent or pressing consideration than a proposal which seeks to improve the administration of justice in India and to relieve it of the scandals which are inseparable from the present system. The soundness of the principle which underlies the reform is admitted, but the practical difficulties in the way of giving effect to it are said to be great. In the early stages of the controversy, the reform was objected to, on the ground of expense. But Mr. Pheroza Mehta and Mr. Dutt have satisfactorily disposed of the objections which have been raised on this score. Let me ask—has the British Government in India been ever deterred from the pursuit of any scheme upon which it set its heart, on the ground of want of funds? In a year of deficit, it paid exchange compensation allowance of 62 lakhs of rupees to its European servants. In the face of heavy deficits, it kept up a Military expenditure which was out of all proportion to its resources. If the security of the country against foreign invasion and

domestic dissensions is a matter of supreme concern to the Government, hardly less so is the efficiency and the purity of the system under which justice is administered. But the financial objection is manifestly untenable in these years of overflowing surpluses. For the purposes of an experiment in selected areas, it never was tenable. In Bengal, the administration of justice brings in a clear profit of nearly 25 lakhs of rupees a year. In the natural order of things the necessary expenditure for the improvement of the system of justice would be the first charge upon this surplus. The proposed reform is admittedly an improvement, whatever might be the Executive reasons which stand in the way of its adoption. A portion of the surplus might surely be applied towards the inauguration of this experiment. But the truth is that it is not financial reasons which block the way. There are, we are told, considerations of administrative expediency—whatever that may mean—which render the separation of Executive and Judicial functions undesirable; and there is the fetish of prestige, to which due worship must be rendered. But prestige which is divorced from justice—which perpetuates a system which often defeats the ends of justice—is not true prestige and can never conduce to the strength or stability of Governments. The prestige theory, however, though influentially supported, vanishes on the slightest examination. Commissioners of Divisions, Secretaries to Government, Members of the Board of Revenue exercise no judicial functions, and yet their prestige is much higher than that of District Officers. It is altogether an irrational sentiment, the remnant of an ancient prejudice, which stands in the way of this reform. We have destroyed the outer barriers; the citadel will soon fall. Reason and equity and the conscience of the community are with us. It is the unreasoning clamour of an exclusive bureaucracy, jealously guarding its powers and its privileges, which for the moment has silenced the voice of reason. But the last word in the controversy has yet to be pronounced by the Viceroy, and we know that His Excellency is the keeper of his own conscience.

•

•

THE POLICE

The reform of the Police is one of Lord Curzon's twelve chosen problems. His Excellency has rightly accorded to this question the prominence which it occupies. The Police is the one department of the State which is in constant touch with the people, and the attitude of the people in relation to the Government is largely determined by the character of the Police. Its efficiency, therefore, is a matter of supreme importance. At the present moment, a Commission is sitting and is collecting evidence with a view to suggest measures for the reform of the Police. For the President of the Commission I have great respect. His conscientiousness, his sympathy with the people, over whom he is placed in authority, and his desire to serve them, have won for him their respect and esteem. At the same time, it must freely be admitted that the representation of the Indian community on the Commission is inadequate, and the Commission evidently has not been constituted in accordance with the broad and salutary principle laid down by Lord Curzon himself. In accordance with that principle, the selection of members should have been regulated "by a careful balance of the interests and merits, not merely of individuals but of provinces, races, and even of creeds". In the selection of members of the Police Commission, it is evident there has been no such careful balancing of the interests and merits of individuals and of provinces and of races and creeds, as laid down by His Excellency. However that may be, I am quite sure there is no desire on the part of the educated community to add to the difficulties of the task, which lies before the Commission, by entering upon a criticism of its constitution. We desire to help the Commission, and I have no doubt your deliberations, conceived in a spirit of genuine friendliness, and with a real desire to co-operate with the Commission, will be found useful by that body. The inefficiency of the Police is notorious. It is the weakest department of the Government, as the Post Office is the strongest. How to render it more efficient, introduce into it a higher

sense of purity and invest it with greater dignity, so that to be a policeman would be regarded as a mark of social honour rather than of social stigma, is the problem, to which the country and the Government have applied themselves for a solution. The problem is not one which is beyond the capacity of Anglo-Indian statesmanship, aided, by the experience and knowledge of a sympathetic community. Similar problems have been dealt with in the past and satisfactorily solved. There was a time, at least in Bengal, when the Subordinate Executive and Judicial Services were not as remarkable for their efficiency or integrity as they now are. But the purity of the Members of these Services, and their ability and devotion, now place them in the front rank among our Public Servants. They are an honour to themselves, to the country and the services which they adorn. The Government of Bengal has recently recognized their worth and the quality of their services by a substantial increase of their emoluments and by the improvement of their status by the promotion of elected members to offices reserved for the Imperial Civil Service. What has brought about this change—what is the secret of this marvellous transformation? The improvement was brought about by the introduction into these Services of educated men—the products of our University—upon suitable pay and assured prospects. Follow the same principle in the reorganization of the Police, and the same results will follow. The reform will be expensive; but it must be faced with the statesmanlike resolution. As the late Sir John Woodburn, whose death all Bengal mourns for his many good qualities of head and heart, said from his place in the Imperial Council: Money is the crux of the whole question. The pay and prospects of the Police, especially of the investigating officers, the sub-inspectors and inspectors, must be substantially improved. The supervision must be more effective. It is no exaggeration to say that the supervision now exercised by the class of officers, known as District Superintendents, is inadequate and ineffective, and the Police will continue to be open to the reproach of inefficiency, so long as the higher offices in

the department are filled by Europeans, imperfectly acquainted with the language and the people and having an inadequate knowledge of law and procedure. So long as these conditions are in force, the superior officers must be pliant tools in the hands of their subordinates whom they are expected to guide and control. The subordinate Police officers, subject to little or no real supervision, wield the authority of their superiors, without any sense of their responsibilities. Far better it would be, if the office of District Superintendent was altogether abolished, and the Magistrate made in reality, as in name he is, the Head of the Police. Let him be relieved of his judicial work, and let him have one or two personal assistants for his Police work. Thus a common measure of reform would add to the efficiency of the Police and bring about the separation of Judicial and Executive functions. From the utterances of an influential Anglo-Indian newspaper, I am inclined to believe that such a reform would commend itself to both Europeans and Indians. But if the office of District Superintendent is at all to be retained, let it not be the monopoly of the incapables—of influential Anglo-Indian families—the haven of their rest. Detection of crime is the principal duty of the Police—and detection in the long run means prevention. The Indian Police is notoriously wanting in detective ability, owing mainly to the higher offices in the Police being manned by Europeans, imperfectly acquainted with the language and the habits of the people. For the efficiency of the Police, therefore, it is a matter of first importance that there should be a substantial leaven of the Indian element in the higher ranks of the Police. But here again we have to repeat the old complaint of the monopoly of the governing race and the exclusion of the children of the soil. In Bengal, out of 80 District and Assistant Superintendents of Police, only 6 are natives of Bengal. For the whole of India, out of 471 Assistant and District Superintendents, only 25 are Indians and 446 are Europeans. This exclusion of our countrymen from the higher offices in the Police was never contemplated by the Public Service Commission, who recommended

that the recruitment for the grade of District Superintendent should be by :

(a) Limited competition amongst candidates selected in England for such portion of the appointments in each Province as the Government of India may decide to be necessary.

(b) Limited competition amongst candidates selected in India, such candidates being carefully chosen on grounds of good physique, the knowledge of the vernacular languages prescribed for the Provincial Service, and high educational qualifications of an English kind.

(c) Promotion from the grade of Inspectors for exceptional merit and ability shown in active service.

(1) That both the competitive examinations, referred to in the foregoing recommendation, should be conducted in accordance with rules approved by the Government of India ; and

(2) That appointments to Inspectorships should, as a rule, be made from the lower grades of the force, and that in no case should outsiders be appointed to Inspectorships merely as a training-ground for the higher offices.

From both the competitive examinations, the one in India and the other in London, natives of India are excluded, though the Public Service Commission made no recommendation to that effect. We have protested against this exclusion, but all in vain. It institutes an irritating racial distinction, in conflict with the terms of the Queen's Proclamation and the avowed policy of the British Government in India. We look forward to the abolition of this distinction as one of the fruits of the labours of the Police Commission. Let there be an open competitive examination for admission to the superior Police Service, subject to such rules regulating intellectual, moral and physical qualifications as may be deemed necessary, but let us not be excluded from it, because forsooth we are Indians !

BRITISH INDIANS IN NATAL

I feel that this presidential address would not be complete without a reference to the position of our countrymen in South Africa. They are fighting a noble battle for the removal of their disabilities in which they claim and are entitled in full measure to our sympathies.

We had hoped that after their splendid behaviour in the South African War—they would be treated with that consideration and sympathy which would be the just reward of their distinguished services. On the eve of the Boer War, we were told by Lord Lansdowne, then Secretary of State for War, that one of the reasons of the War was the unjust treatment of British Indians by the Boer Republic. The War is over; the Indians manfully did their part; never was their loyalty or their self-sacrificing devotion more conspicuous; but their disabilities continue, and the generous recognition of their services seems to be a remote, if not an uncertain, prospect. The inventory of their disabilities is a melancholy record, galling to their self-respect and unworthy of those who permit them. No Indian can enter the Orange River Colony, except as a domestic servant. In the Transvaal, he is treated as an outcaste, one whom Society barely tolerates, and every circumstance of his life is so ordained by a beneficent administration that he is reminded at each stage, in almost every function of his daily life, that he is the representative of an inferior race, and that on no account should he be oblivious of the artificial status, thus forced upon him by superior authority. He cannot by law walk on the foot-paths or travel first or second class on the Railways. He must live in locations set apart for him, and must possess no property except in these locations. As if the measure of his degradation was not full, he must carry a pass, and, finally, in the spirit of the Curfew Regulations of William the Conqueror, he must not be out after 9 o'clock in the evening. Never was there a more complete code of sanitary and moral regulations than what the late Transvaal Government devised for the benefit of British Indians. It has come to the British Rulers of the Transvaal as a legacy; and it is allowed to blot the statute-book and sully the fair fame of British administration. The state of things in Natal is not much better. Nothing is more repugnant to the spirit of British laws or the genius of British institutions than irritating distinctions, founded upon race or colour. Yet such distinctions are ruthlessly enforced against British Indians in Natal, under the

colour of British laws administered by British officers. Indian youths are debarred from the Government schools in Natal. British Indians cannot enter Natal, unless they have a knowledge of one of the European languages. A recent measure imposes on the minor children of indentured Indians a tax of £3 per year, unless they return to India on the termination of their parents' indentures. It is useless to pile up the list. It is a goodly catalogue of disabilities; and all Indians, be they coolies or be they princes, are treated with the same impartial justice—the same status for all—the same disabilities operative in the case of all, working with the persistency and uniformity of the dispensations of Nature. It is melancholy to have to reflect that the South African legislators should have so little knowledge of India and the circumstances of Indian life as to confound the cooly with the cultured Indian, the aboriginal inhabitant with the representative of a civilization, older than any which the memory of man can recall, and in comparison to which the civilization and culture of Europe are but of yesterday. But the darkest cloud has its silver lining. The firm attitude of the Secretary of State inspires us with the hope and the confidence that he will not permit the perpetuation of disabilities which he regards with strong disapproval and just indignation. The stoppage of the importation of Indian labour would seriously handicap the trade and industries of South Africa. Such a step is not lightly to be thought of; nor is it to be regarded as being altogether beyond the domain of practical politics. A supreme necessity may call for a supreme remedy. The Secretary of State is in the place of the Great Moghul, with powers and responsibilities far greater than ever belonged to the most illustrious of that race. The welfare of India and the honour of the Indian peoples are entrusted to his care and keeping, and I am sure he will not permit them to be treated as worse than helots, on a par with African savages, when, by the exercise of his undoubted constitutional authority, he can ensure to them a better and more considerate treatment. We also look forward to the very best results from Mr. Chamberlain's visit to South

Africa, for, as Mr. John Morley has truly observed : that no one is more qualified by genius and temperament to reconcile conflicting interests, to heal the animosities engendered by racial strife, and to lay broad and deep the foundations of a new political structure in South Africa, where equal rights and equal privileges shall be the heritage of all British subjects.

THE CONGRESS : ITS MISSION

To-day we begin our work for the 18th Session of the Congress. The mind is spontaneously carried back to the past—to the trials we have endured, the labours we have undergone, the disappointments we have suffered and the triumphs we have achieved. The time has not yet arrived for the final judgment, for the authoritative pronouncement of history, on the work of the Congress. We are yet in the midst of our journey, our long, long journey, through the dreary wilderness, which is to carry us to the Promised Land. Many will not enter Canaan. Some choice spirits have already fallen in the grand march. Many more will yet fall before the journey is accomplished, and the darkness of night gives place to the dawning of the new day. Some of us who cannot promise to ourselves length of days can only anticipate with the eye of hope and faith the blessings of the Promised Land. But the faith that is in us is strong and the hope that inspires us is proof against all disappointments—all reverses. We have an undying faith, as strong as ever inspired a prophet or a priest, that the cause to which we are pledged will, in the ordering of Providence, triumph over all difficulties, outlive all prejudices, leading us onward and upward, inspiring at each stage a loftier devotion and developing a truer manhood, until the regenerated man claims and asserts his political franchise as at once his birthright and the just tribute of his higher nature. For myself, I believe the Congress has a divine mission. It is a dispensation of Almighty God for the unification of our peoples and the permanence of British Rule in India. Thus, we are gathered together under the ægis of an organization, political in its character and in its scope, but

drawing its strength and its inspiration from those ever-living fountains which flow from the footsteps of the throne of the Supreme. Sree Krishna—the divinely inspired Sree Krishna—who has his shrine at Dwarka in the province of Guzerat, in his memorable admonition to Arjuna on the battle-field of *Kurukshetra*, said *Karma* is *Dharma* (good deeds constitute religion). Is there a holier *Dharma*, a nobler religion, a diviner mandate than that which enjoins that our most sacred duty, which has a paramountcy over all others, is the duty which we owe to the land of our birth.

What are trials—what are delays, what are disappointments—what is even the cankering worry of vexation in the presence of this consecrated task? They are the necessary incidents of the struggle in which we are engaged—the ordeal of fire through which we must pass—the purificatory stage which must qualify us for the rich blessings that are in store for us. They will strengthen our fibre, develop our manhood, ennoble our nature and call forth whatever is good and great in us. The chastening discipline of adverse circumstances is the necessary apprenticeship for the splendid heritage to which we aspire. We ought to thank God on our knees that the discipline is so mild—the sacrifice entailed so insignificant. Read the ensanguined pages of history—note the trial of blood and the hecatombs of mangled corpses, with all their attendant horror and desolation, which mark the line along which victorious movements of reform have careered their triumphant way. We live in happier times, under more fortunate circumstances, under the beneficent protection of a rule which affords the widest tolerance for the widest differences of opinion and evinces the deepest sympathy for all constitutional struggles for constitutional liberty. Yet we have our trials and our disappointments. The forces of reaction are now in the ascendant. The cause of progress has met with a temporary check. For the moment we have been worsted. For the moment we have lost ground. But we Congressmen never confess to a defeat. We bide our time in firm conviction that the

turn in the tide will come and the forces which make for progress will once again assert their undisputed supremacy.

THE NEW IMPERIALISM

Imperialism blocks the way. Imperialism is now the prevailing creed. Imperialism has always been synonymous with autocracy—the rule of the despotic monarch or of the victorious general who has made his way to sovereign power. In ancient Rome, as in modern France, imperialism meant the supersession of popular authority and the establishment of one-man authority. British Imperialism does not, indeed, imply the extinction of British democracy. It means Self-Government for Great Britain and her Colonies, autocracy for the rest of the British Empire. What its latent possibilities are, it is impossible to say. Whether in its further developments, it will lead to the curtailment of democratic power is one of those secrets, hidden deep in the bosom of time, regarding which even the most confident predictions may prove futile. But all history bears record that the extension of territory and power over subject-races is fatal to popular Government. Let us not however speculate about the future. British imperialism implies the closer union—the more intimate federation between the English-speaking subjects of His Majesty. We stand outside the pale of this federation. We are not admitted into this inner sanctuary of freedom. We are not permitted to enter the threshold of the Holy of Holies. We are privileged only to serve and to admire from a distance. As a part of the Empire, we sent out troops to South Africa, and they saved Natal. As a part of the Empire, we sent out troops to China, and our Indian soldiery planted the imperial standard on the walls of Peking. Our loyalty is admittedly so genuine, so deep and so intensely realistic that even the Secretary of State had no conception of it. All the same, we are not the children of the Empire, entitled to its great constitutional privileges. We are Uitlanders in the land of our birth, worse than helots in the British Colonies. Our countrymen in Natal, whose splendid behaviour during the late war was the subject of unstinted praise, are still exposed to a

degrading treatment which is galling to their self-respect and discreditable to those who permit it. British Imperialism, which is so sedulous in exalting British greatness, is not equally sedulous in opening up to us the possibilities of our greatness. British Imperialism, which seeks to draw closer the bonds of union between the Mother Country and the Colonies, has literally done nothing to cement the loyalty or deepen the gratitude of the Indian people. I would welcome an Imperialism which would draw us nearer to Britain by the ties of a common citizenship and which would enhance our self-respect, by making us feel that we are participators in the priceless heritage of British freedom. But we are as yet very far from this blessed consummation. In India, imperialism has accentuated the forces of reaction and has engendered a love of pomp and show which is apt to encourage extravagance and to withdraw attention from the graver issues of domestic reform. We are not, therefore, prepared to welcome the new imperialism in the form and garb in which it appears to us. Mr. Gladstone's sound liberalism, with its strenuous persistency in the matter of domestic reform, with its thorough recognition of England's grave responsibilities in relation to India, would be to us far more acceptable than the imperialism which indulges in expensive pageants, but which turns a deaf ear to the cry of the coolies in the tea-gardens of Assam, which often subordinates our interests to other interests and which relies for the justification of Imperial Rule upon the pomp and circumstances of Imperial grandeur rather than upon the solid and enduring basis of truly Imperial achievements.

A DESPONDING VIEW OF THE SITUATION

I have no doubt that the new Imperialism is a passing frenzy which the robust common sense of the English people will ere long discountenance and that it will soon pass away, like so many of the varying fashions of the hour. But whether that be so or not, we must be sleepless in our vigilance and unremitting in our efforts to stem the tide and roll it back. We have no reason to be discouraged. The past ought to stimulate us and to stir

us into new enthusiasm. Ours is a brilliant record. I claim for the Congress that it has never taken up a question which it has not brought within the range of practical politics. You took up the question of the separation of Judicial and Executive functions. The matter is awaiting consideration by the Government of India. You agitated for the reform of the Police. A Police Commission is now sitting to elaborate a scheme of Police reform. You insisted in season and out of season upon the wider employment of our countrymen in the Public Service. The Public Service Commission was appointed; and though much remains to be done, the impetus you communicated to the movement will produce enduring results. Last but not least, your crowning triumph was the introduction of the representative principle into the government of the country. But your moral achievements, though less palpable and obtrusive, are a yet more enduring monument of your public spirit and your self-sacrificing devotion. You have created a new spirit and have infused a new life into our people. You have brought together the varied and multitudinous races and peoples of India upon the same common platform and have inspired them with a lofty sense of patriotism. You have established a new bond of sympathy among them and their leaders and have taught them the value of organised effort, with all the infinite possibilities of good attendant thereon.

Yet there are those who take a desponding view of the situation—who say that our methods are faulty, that we have wasted our time and our breath, or that at any rate the results achieved have not been commensurate to the sacrifices incurred or the efforts put forth. There are moments of despondency which cast their shadows over the noblest and most unselfish natures, when the spirit appalled at the sacrifices made, shrinks back at the contemplation of the disproportioned achievement. In the anguish of disappointment, the question is asked—what is the good of persevering in methods and in sacrifices, when the outturn of them all is so insignificant? I confess I have nothing but respect for those who, with the utmost

good-will for the Congress and ceaseless in their endeavours for the public weal, are sometimes apt to indulge in these sombre reflections. But I ask—has the time come for the final judgment? I ask—are the results inadequate? Even if they were—what are 20 years in the life-time of a nation? The triumphs of liberty are not won in a day. Liberty is a jealous goddess, exacting in her worship and claiming from her votaries prolonged and assiduous devotion. Read history. Learn from it the estimable lesson of patience and fortitude and the self-sacrificing devotion which a constitutional struggle for constitutional liberty involves. Need I impress these lessons upon a people who have presented to the world the noblest examples of these virtues? Every page of Indian history is resplendent with the touch of self-abnegation. In seasons of doubt and despair when darkness thickens upon us, when the journey before us seems to be long and weary and the soul sinks under the accumulating pressure of adverse circumstances, may we not turn for inspiration and guidance to those great teachers of our race—those master-spirits—who, with their hearts aglow with the divine enthusiasm, triumphed over the failing spirit, faced disappointment and persecution with the serenity of a higher faith and lived to witness the complete realization of their ideals? Chaitanya and Nanak, Tukaram and Ram Das lift the mind high up to the sublimer eminence of the divine ideal. India of the past is rich in these examples. May we not hope for their successors in the India of the present, in the India of the Congress, in the India under British Rule, with all the stirring influences of Western life and civilization? The responsibilities of the present, the hopes of the future, the glories of the past ought all to inspire us with the noblest enthusiasm to serve our country. Is there a land more worthy of service and sacrifice? Where is a land more interesting, more venerated in antiquity, more rich in historic traditions, in the wealth of religious, ethical and spiritual conceptions which have left an enduring impress on the civilization of mankind? India is the cradle of true religions. It is the holy land of the East. Here knowledge first lit her torch. Here, in the morning of the

world, the Vedic Rishis sang those hymns which represent the first yearnings of infant humanity towards the divine ideal. Here was developed a literature and a language which still excites the admiration of mankind—a philosophy which pondered deep over the problems of life and evolved solutions which satisfied the highest yearnings of the loftiest minds. Here man first essayed to solve the mystery of life, and the solution wrapped in the rich colours of the poetic imagination and clothed with the deeper significance of a higher spiritual idea, bids fair, thanks to the genius of the greatest Hindu scientist of the age, to be accepted by the world of science. From our shores went forth those missionaries who fired with apostolic fervour traversed the wilds of Asia and established the ascendancy of that faith which is the law and the religion of the nations of the Far East. Japan is our spiritual pupil. China and Siberia and the island of the Eastern Archipelago turn with reverend eyes to the land where was born the prophet of their faith. Our pupils have out-distanced us ; and where are we, hesitating, doubting, calculating, casting up moral results to satisfy ourselves that our gains have been commensurate to our sacrifices. Such, indeed, has not been the Royal road to political enfranchisement. The triumphs of liberty have not thus been won. Japan is an object-lesson which thrusts itself upon the view. Read her history ; note her wonderful self-sacrifice, her marvellous power of adaptation, her patience, her fortitude, her indomitable energy and persistency, and let the most ancient of Eastern nations derive inspiration and guidance from the youngest which has solved the riddle of Asiatic life and has harmonized the conservatism of the East with the progressive forces of the West.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL STRUGGLE

In the constitutional struggle in which we are engaged, we need the co-operation of Englishmen and the sympathies of civilized mankind. It is England which has created in us those political aspirations, the fruition of which we now claim. Our souls have been stirred by

the great models of public virtue which the pages of English history so freely present. Where shall we find the like of them? Their sobriety, their moderation, their lofty enthusiasm for the public good, their scrupulous regard for constitutional principles, even amid the fervour and heat of revolutionary agitation, place them in the front rank of political leaders for all times and all countries. Englishmen must accept the consequences of their own policy—they must cheerfully face the results which are the outcome of their own beneficent administration. They must gratify the ambitions which they have roused and adapt their administration to the altered conditions which are of their own creation. They have taught us the principle of adaptation to the environments of our situation, and they must not complain, if we, as their apt pupils, invite them to reduce to practice what they enforce by precept. We have no higher aspiration than that we should be admitted into the great confederacy of self-governing States, of which England is the august mother. We recognize that the journey towards the destined goal must necessarily be slow and that the blessed consummation can only be attained after prolonged preparation and laborious apprenticeship. But a beginning has to be made, and there seems to be no more suitable time for inaugurating this new departure, for commemorating the new epoch which is to mark the birth of an emancipated people than the commencement of the new reign. The Victorian epoch, memorable in its achievements, is still more memorable in the generous impulse to human freedom which it communicated in all parts of the world. We shared in full measure the beneficent influences of that epoch. Our disabilities were removed, our rights were extended, higher ideals of Government were recognized and a loftier conception of Imperial duty enforced. A succession of illustrious Viceroys imparted an impetus to this beneficent movement. To the new Sovereign, to whom on his Coronation we offer our respectful salutation, we appeal to commemorate his glorious reign by the still further expansion of those great traditions of government which have been consecrated by

the example of his illustrious mother and which more than British arms have contributed to the solidarity of the British Empire. We have a special claim upon His Majesty's sympathetic consideration. The recollections of his Indian tour are to us a grateful memory. We know him. He knows us. His Majesty's feelings in relation to us are those of personal goodwill. Our feelings in relation to him are those of personal attachment and devotion, emphasized by the recollections of his general warmth, his truly kingly benignity, his royal condescension, his generous concern for all placed under his authority. The words of the Proclamation are still ringing in our ears, consecrated by the breath of his illustrious mother, our late Sovereign. We have His Majesty's assurance that he proposes to follow the traditions of his great mother, that the happiness of the Princes and the People of India would be to him matters of the highest concern, and that he would endeavour to promote the general well-being of all classes of his Indian subjects, and thus merit their loyalty and affection. We appeal to His Majesty to enthrone himself in the hearts of his people and to lay broad and deep the foundations of his Empire, by the practical recognition of the claims of the people of India to a just and adequate representation in the government of their country, by the gradual extension to them of that system of Self-Government which has been the invariable accompaniment of British power and civilization and which, wherever it has been granted, has been the strongest bulwark of Imperial Rule and has evoked the affectionate gratitude of the people. Under the beneficent influences of Self-Government, alien races, hostile to the British connection, have been transformed into loyal and devoted subjects of the Crown. We need no such transformation. We are already sufficiently loyal, sufficiently attached to the British connection. But we are anxious for the permanence of British rule—for our permanent incorporation into the great confederacy of the British Empire. The present system of government necessarily represents a transition. All history proclaims the truth that autocratic power is devoid

of the elements of permanence, and that authority to be permanent must be planted deep in the affections of the people and derive its sustaining breath from the vitalizing springs of popular enthusiasm. The voice of the people is the voice of God and the right divine to rule is based on the unchangeable foundations of the love, the gratitude, the devotion of a people, evoked by the consciousness that they share with their rulers the responsibilities of government. Despotic rule represents a stage of transition, the period of which should not be unnecessarily prolonged. But transition must give place to permanence. All signs point to the conclusion that the period of reconstruction has now arrived. The forces are there; the materials are there; they lie in shapeless masses. Where is the man of genius who will communicate to them the vital spark and transform them into a new and a higher and a grander organization, suited to our present requirements and fraught with the hopes of a higher life for us and a nobler era for British Rule in India? The statesmanship of Mr. Chamberlain, bent upon work of reconstruction and consolidation in South Africa, will pale before the splendour of this crowning achievement. We plead for the permanence of British rule in India. We plead for the gradual reconstruction of that ancient and venerated system, which has given to India law and order and the elements of stable peace. We plead for justice and liberty—for equal rights and enlarged privileges—for our participation in the citizenship of the Empire; and I am sure we do not plead in vain; for the Empire thus reconstituted and reorganized will be stronger, nobler, richer far, in the love, the gratitude, the enthusiastic devotion of a happy and contented people, rejoicing in their indissoluble union with England and glorying in the rich promises of steady and uninterrupted progress towards their high destinies, under the protection and guidance of that great people, to whom in the counsels of Providence has been assigned the high mission and the consecrated task of disseminating among the nations of the earth, the great, the priceless, the inestimable blessing of constitutional liberty.

MR. LAL MOHAN GHOSE

INTRODUCTION

FELLOW-DELEGATES,—I thank you heartily for the high honour you have done me, and I ask your permission to take this opportunity of offering my grateful thanks to the citizens of Madras of all classes and of both sexes who, rich and poor, young and old, united together last evening to give me a welcome, the warmth of which overwhelmed me with the deepest emotion. But, Gentlemen, although yesterday was undoubtedly one of the proudest days of my life, yet from another point of view it was also a day of humiliation. For I could not but make a mental contrast between my humble labours on behalf of our common country and the splendid ovation which Madras was kind enough to accord to me.

It has pleased my Honourable friend, Mr. Mehta, to refer by anticipation to some observations in my inaugural address. He calls me a political *yogee*. But if political activity has its value, political *yogism*, as my friend calls it and which I prefer to describe as thought and meditation, is not without its uses. Mr. Mehta adds that having been a *yogee* for some time, I have been labouring under some delusions. He assures us that there have been no differences in our camp worth speaking of. It may be so. I have no personal knowledge of these matters. But if I have laboured under any delusions, I have at least the consolation of knowing that my delusions were shared by some of the leading Indian newspapers, both of Calcutta and of this city. Mr. Mehta also assures us that he himself has never been autocratic in his conduct as a leader.

I freely accept his assurance. But he will also perhaps permit me to express my surprise that he should have been so ready to apply to himself Gibbon's observation with reference to the Roman Tribune, Baroucelli. I shall now proceed to read my inaugural address, for I do not think that it is necessary that I should go through the farce of pretending to speak a speech which was in print before I left Calcutta.

Ladies and Gentlemen,—I had hoped, indeed, I had publicly declared only a few months ago in my native town of Krishnaghur, that after the storm and stress of more than a quarter of a century of political life, it was my desire to devote the remainder of my days to the peaceful worship of the goddess of letters undisturbed by the noise and bustle of the political arena. I am, by constitution and temperament, a student and a recluse. But our destinies are shaped by a higher Power than our own inclinations or our own natural aptitudes. Thus, it has happened that, by an irony of fate, the best years of my life have been spent in the storm and strife of politics. And it seems that even now when I was flattering myself that I might be permitted to follow the natural bent of my own mind, leaving the work of my earlier days to be carried on with greater energy and vigour by the rising generation so many of whom I am happy to see here to-day,—it seems I was reckoning without my host. But since it has been your pleasure, Gentlemen, to drag me out of the seclusion of my study, in obedience to your mandate, I once more appear before you on the platform of this our Great National Gathering to discuss with each other some of the most important political questions affecting the well-being of our common country.

NOT A RIP VAN WINKLE

Fellow-Delegates,—Although for the last few years I have not been able to take the same active part in the discussion of our public affairs as I had been accustomed to do in former years, I can truly say that I do not come before you as a political Rip Van Winkle, for these latter

years, if they have not been a period of action, they have been a period of thought and reflection. I have followed every important political question with unabated interest, and perhaps the views slowly matured in the retirement of my study may be somewhat worthier of your attention than if I had rushed to the platform on every imaginable occasion. My recent abstention from active political life might perhaps also have another compensating advantage, and that is this, that I am absolutely unconnected with the factions and cliques which, I understand from the newspapers, have caused and are still causing considerable mischief by sowing dissension and discord among our public men. Far be it from me to presume to point out the path of duty to those who, by their abilities and their services, have justly risen to the rank of leaders, but I may perhaps be permitted to remind our young men that as the very aim and object, the *raison d'être*, of the National Congress is to introduce some little popular element into the autocratic constitution of the Indian Government, so if they ever aspire to be the leaders of our people, they should be especially careful that their own acts may not be condemned as autocratic by the rank and file of our party. They should take care that it may not be said of any of them what Gibbon says of one of the Roman Tribunes that, "he spoke the language of patriots and trod in the footsteps of despots". If we are really sincere in our professions of democratic faith, let us prove our sincerity not merely by mellifluent phrases, but by deeds more eloquent than words. The greatest of modern poets has told us that, "words without thoughts never to heaven go". And going to the very antipodes of poetry, we find that the greatest of soldiers and the most practical of men, the Emperor Napoleon, in the zenith of his power, referring to one of the many libels published against him, prohibited his ministers from contradicting it and used the memorable words, *les declamations passent—les action res tent!* Next to the approbation of my own conscience, I have never looked forward to any higher reward than the approval of my fellow-countrymen. Nevertheless, I can truly say for myself that I have never been

anxious to set my sails to catch every passing breeze of popularity. I have always considered it to be my first and most sacred duty to express my sincere and conscientious opinions freely and frankly, regardless of the frowns of the Government, and even at the risk of losing some portion of the popularity and good opinion, which must naturally be welcome to those who have grown grey in the service of their country.

Gentlemen, I hope no one will misunderstand me. It is my desire in this Presidential Address, and it is my highest ambition, to hold the balance evenly between the Government and the people. Lord Curzon said the other day that he saw the hand of Providence in the extension of British Rule over distant and different peoples, and went on to add that there was not a single man amongst his hearers who would not admit that it was for his good. Unfortunately, Gentlemen, Providence is only too often appealed to, whether by the governing classes or by the leaders of the masses. Just as, in the time of violent popular excitement, mischief-making agitators pretend to hear the voice of God in every shout of the infuriated mob, so sovereigns and rulers invested with despotic powers, from the time of the Grecian Alexander to that of the German Kaiser of our days, find it easy to believe that every act of theirs is the direct result of divine inspiration. And coming to the case of our own country,, although there is not a man amongst us who is not sincerely loyal to the British Government, yet claiming the undoubted right to British subjects to criticise the acts of the Government, may we not respectfully ask our rulers—and in this connection I make no distinction between the different English political parties—may we not ask whether we are to believe that the policy which many years ago killed our indigenous industries, which even only the other day and under a Liberal Administration unblushingly imposed excise duties on our cotton manufactures, which steadily drains our national resource to the extent of some thing like 20 millions sterling per annum, and which, by imposing heavy burdens on our agricultural population, increase

the frequency and intensity of our famines to an extent unknown in former times—are we to believe that the various administrative acts which have led to those results were directly inspired by the beneficent Providence?

VOX POPULI VOX DEI

But, Gentlemen, as I have already said I desire to be strictly impartial. It is not Governments and Rulers alone who claim to seek shelter under the wide wings of Providence. History tells us that there always will be demagogues and popularity-hunters, who, whenever they are at a loss for arguments in support of their crude notions, try to take refuge behind democratic shibboleths, and “tickle the ears of the groundlings” by exclaiming in season and out of season *vox populi vox dei*. Now, Gentlemen, great as is my respect for healthy public opinion, and much as I desire that our Government should recognise and give effect to it, I am bound to say that never was a more grossly misleading proposition clothed with the dignity of a classical tongue. Those who have read history and read it to some purpose, will agree with me that the voice of the people, just like the voice of despots, has very often been far from being the voice of God. When, in the dark days of Queen Mary, fanatical mobs exulted over the tortures of Protestant martyrs burnt alive at Smithfield, —was the voice of the people the voice of God? When towards the end of the eighteenth century, the French people maddened with the lust of blood, hunted down aristocrats and emigrants in the sacred name of liberty, when the innocence of childhood, the helplessness of the gentle sex, and the infirmities of age appealed to them alike in vain,—when the blood-thirsty mob, fiends in human form, shouted themselves hoarse, as the saintly Louis, the long suffering Marie Antoinette, the scholarly Bailley, the venerable and learned Malherbes, and a host of other victims were led to execution, will any one dare to maintain at the present day that the voice of the French people during the Reign of Terror was *Vox Dei* and not *Vox Diaboli*? Let us, therefore, beware of clap-trap phrases and flashy rhetoric, and whenever we advocate a particular

reform, let us be prepared to stand or fall on the merits of that question, and if, after proving that our contention is right, we can show further that we are supported by public opinion, we should be within measurable distance of the winning post. At the same time, I do not disguise from myself the fact that we have a formidable task before us. We are not a self-governing nation. We are not able, like the English people, to change one administration for another by our votes in the polling booths. We have to depend entirely upon the justice of the British Parliament; for unfortunately it is only too true, that as time advances, our Indian bureaucracy, instead of coming into line with popular ideas, seem to grow more and more unsympathetic. Do you think that any administration in England, or France or the United States would have ventured to waste vast sums of money on an empty pageant when Famine and Pestilence were stalking over the land, and the Angel of Death was flapping his wings almost within hearing of the light-hearted revellers ?

A POMPOUS PAGEANT TO A PERISHING PEOPLE

Gentlemen, a year has now rolled by since the great political pageant was held at Delhi against the almost unanimous protests of all our public and representative men both in the press and on the platform. On what ground did they protest ? They protested not because they were wanting in loyalty to the Sovereign whose Coronation it was intended to celebrate, but because they felt that if His Majesty's ministers had done their duty and had laid before him an unvarnished story of his famine-stricken subjects in India, His Majesty, with his characteristic sympathy for suffering humanity, would himself have been the first to forbid his representatives in this country to offer a pompous pageant to a starving population. However, our protests were disregarded, and the great *tamasha* was celebrated with that utter recklessness of expense which you may always expect when men, no matter however highly placed, were dealing with other people's money and were practically accountable to no one for their acts.

We are all familiar with the financial jugglery which, by distributing the expenses under various, and sometimes under the most unexpected headings, makes it so difficult for ordinary men to find out the total cost of such a pageant. Still, whether you estimate that cost by a few lakhs more or less, it cannot be denied that if even half of the vast sum spent in connection with the Delhi Durbar had been made over for the purposes of famine relief, it might have been the means of saving millions of men, women and children from death by starvation. "One touch of Nature makes the whole world kin," and His Majesty Edward VII, the son and successor of our beloved and revered Queen Victoria, won the hearts, not only of his British subjects, but also of the countless millions of his subjects in this country when it became known, that of all the various functions in connection with the Coronation in England, that which specially appealed to the sympathy and interest of the Sovereign was the feeding of half a million of the poor at His Majesty's own expense. Can we doubt, therefore, what His Majesty's own verdict would have been if the true condition of his Indian subjects had been faithfully laid before him by those who represent him in this country and the Minister whose duty it is to advise him in regard to Indian affairs?

PAYING THE PIPER

But apart from the enormous expenditure incurred by the Government of India, what has been the result to the independent Native States? Information is now beginning to leak out showing how little some of these States were prepared to bear the extraordinary expense—or shall I say extravagance—which was forced upon them by the invitation to the Delhi Durbar. It is stated by a retired English Covenanted Civil Servant of 28 years' service that one State became temporarily bankrupt owing to three causes:—(1) Famine; (2) expenses in connection with the Coronation trip to England; and (3) the still heavier outlay at Delhi. Be that as it may, it is well known that all the Native States, almost without exception, have found the drain upon their resources so

heavy that they have been obliged to curtail their expenditure by postponing many urgently-needed works of utility. Now, let us ask ourselves if anything has been gained by the Delhi Durbar, which may even for a moment be balanced against these sad results. But with every desire to take a fair and impartial view of the whole question, I cannot say that this "sable cloud turns forth her silver lining on the night". As to the masses of the people, nothing could possibly seem more utterly heartless than the spectacle of a great Government imposing the heaviest taxation upon the poorest population in the world, and then lavishly spending the money so obtained over fireworks and pompous pageants while millions of the poor were dying of starvation. As to the middle classes, the most representative men generally kept aloof and were conspicuous by their absence, and of those who entered an appearance on that occasion most of them came back with bitter memories of the different treatment received by Indians and Europeans both during travelling and at the Durbar itself.

THE POSITION OF OUR PRINCES

Then how about the Princes and the Feudatory Chiefs? If it be true, as I believe it is, that one of the objects that Lord Curzon had in view, was that our Princes and Nobles should meet on a common platform and thereby arrive at a better understanding and cultivate more cordial relations with each other, then all I can say is that never had good intention met with a more signal failure. The descendants of the Sovereign Princes, before whom English merchants had presented themselves on bended knees, and with whom the East India Company, after they had acquired sovereign rights in this country, concluded treaties as Allies—the descendants of those Princes found themselves treated as ordinary subjects and their proud and sensitive natures were subjected to a humiliation which they had never known before under the British Government. I have said that our Indian Princes, instead of being treated as the Allies and Feudatories of His Britannic Majesty, have been treated like ordinary

subjects, but I ought to add in order to fill up the picture, that the princes are denied the rights and privileges of British subjects. If the poorest and meanest of His Majesty's subjects in India is charged with the most heinous offence known to the law, he has the right to be tried by a jury of his peers and, if found guilty, he has the further right of appealing to the highest judicial tribunal of the Presidency to which he belongs. But in the case of an Indian Prince, if his enemies succeed in persuading the British Resident that he has committed some grave offence, the Government of India, endorsing the opinion of its Political Agent, directs his trial before a special commission entirely composed of British officials and the verdict of such a special commission is always a foregone conclusion. Nor is this to be wondered at, for we have it on the authority of an illustrious historian that even in Europe where there are no racial prejudices, "a military commission to which a government sends accused persons of importance, never knows how to send them back to it absolved". And what is true of a military commission is equally true of a special commission of Civilian officials whose promotion and prospects depend upon the good opinion of the Government. On one occasion only, in the case of Mulhar Rao Gackwar, the Indian Government tried the experiment of a mixed commission. But in that case the Indian Commissioners, consisting of two princes and a statesman of repute, returned a verdict of acquittal, but the three English officials associated with them proved the truth of M. Thiers' observation and "knew not how to send back absolved an accused person of such importance". Lord Curzon the other day, at Alwar, sneered at our endeavours to get better treatment for our princes as making "bad blood" between them and the Government. Gentlemen, we know how helpless our princes are, and if we, who are British subjects, endeavour to see that our princes are at least as well off as ourselves, can that be justly described as making "bad blood"? Sneers such as these may become a Brummagem Imperialist like Mr. Chamberlain, but are they worthy of a large hearted statesman like Lord Curzon?

THE BIRMINGHAM CONJURER

Speaking of Mr. Chamberlain naturally reminds me of the great fiscal question which is now absorbing the attention of the people of the British Isles. At a time when the great Birmingham conjurer, with two loaves made to order, is performing wonderful tricks before his simple-minded audiences—tricks which our own professional jugglers may be proud of when this great man is inviting the British people to take leave of their senses and to come to the conclusion that the excess of imports over exports, instead of being an indication of increasing national wealth and prosperity is a proof of national decadence,—I say this is a fit and proper occasion to draw your attention to the converse state of things existing here. In England, imports exceed exports by many millions. Mr. Chamberlain asks the country to weep over this result. Here in India our exports exceed our imports by many millions. If Mr. Chamberlain's view were right, we should rejoice to find our exports exceeding our imports. But in my opinion the balance of trade is against us, and it is we who ought to weep over the drain to which our country is annually subjected. As this proposition with regard to India will be best proved by disproving Mr. Chamberlain's allegations, I shall ask your permission to quote a few sentences from an old speech of my own delivered at Greenwich during my Parliamentary candidature, dealing with the same subject which was then raised by our Tory opponents. Remember, Gentlemen, that Mr. Chamberlain was at that time one of the greatest champions of Free Trade. The cry now raised is nothing new. We were perfectly familiar with it in 1884, and the following was the substance of my reply to Baron de Worms and Mr. Boord, the sitting members for the then united Borough of Greenwich. I quote from the *Greenwich Observer* of November 28, 1884:—

FREE TRADE AND PROTECTION

Both the sitting members had dwelt at great length and had encouraged the idea that the present depression and consequent distress were owing more or less to the policy of Free Trade. The

leaders of the Conservative Party who, like Sir Stafford Northcote, were perfectly convinced of the absurdity of these doctrines still deemed it politic to profess a considerable degree of indulgence for what they regarded as pious notions. I venture to think that the whole policy of the Conservative Party, in regard to this vital question consists of mere weak vacillation, of dreaming and coquetting with ignorant quacks and false prophets who believe that by merely avoiding the use of the word Protection, and by substituting some other phrase such as Reciprocity or Retaliation they would succeed in deluding the people of this country. Well, these people, the Fair Traders relied mostly upon the comparison between the imports and exports of this country. They pointed to the great excess of imports over exports and told them that that was a sure sign of national extravagance and impending ruin. It is an undoubted fact that your imports exceed your exports by a very large amount—reaching I believe the sum of something like 160 millions sterling. The fact was undisputed and the only question was whether it was a sign of national decadence, whether it was a gigantic evil or on the contrary, a matter for national congratulation. They who believed in Free Trade believed that the excess of imports was a conclusive proof of national wealth and prosperity. The first thing to bear in mind was this: that if they (the English people) did not sell a single shilling's worth of goods to the foreigner, they would still have to receive a large sum from various countries of the world on account of their foreign investments in every quarter of the universe, and also on account of being the largest ocean carriers and the largest insurers of the trade of the world. Now, they all know that all international transactions of that kind were carried on chiefly by barter or exchange of goods and but an insignificant part in gold and silver. Therefore these various sums must come to England in the shape of gold and must necessarily swell the amount of their imports. . . . But let them look at the question from another point of view. . . . What Free Traders said was that almost the whole of these imports represented only what they bought from foreign countries. Well, if that was so, if the whole of their excess of imports over exports represented nothing more or less than the excess of their purchases over their sales, then he thought it would be only fair and reasonable to suppose that these gigantic purchases had been somehow or other paid for, because they could scarcely assume that the traders of the world had been so foolish and idiotic as to sell their goods without receiving payment in any shape or form.

Turning to the Board of Trade Returns, they found that from the year 1854 down to 1880, a period of 27 years, their imports had exceeded their exports by a sum of not less than 1,700 millions sterling in round numbers. Now how did they think that gigantic sum had been paid for? Surely it could never have been paid for by exchange of goods, for the very fact of their imports exceeding

the exports by that amount was absolutely conclusive upon that point. Nor could this enormous sum have been paid in money. He had already said that international payments were never made to any appreciable extent in money, bullion, or specie. If they would allow him, he would give a striking illustration of the fact. After the Franco-Prussian War, early in 1873, the French Government made a very large payment to Germany—a payment of not less than 94 millions pounds sterling. And how was it paid? Only six millions in gold and silver and eight millions in bank notes—the whole of the remainder, not less than 80 millions being paid by bills of exchange on various countries, which, of course, represented the value of the commodities which France had to export in order to pay that indemnity to Germany. But quite apart from general experience, they had a sure test in the statistics furnished by the Board of Trade as regards the exports and imports of gold and silver. . . . So that altogether they had the astounding fact that from 1854 to 1880, they had not only received from the various countries of the world goods to the value of 1,700 millions sterling in excess of their exports but that during the same period they had also imported gold and silver amounting to over 100 millions sterling. Then how about the payment? As they had already seen it could not have been by exchange of goods, nor could it have been in money because their imports of specie had exceeded their exports by not less than 100 millions sterling; thus the whole thing was reduced to what used to be called when he studied geometry at school a *reductio ad absurdum*. Therefore, whichever way they looked at this question of excess of imports, it was no indication of national decadence but of national wealth and prosperity. The case of his own country—and here fellow-delegates and ladies and gentlemen, I invite your special attention—the case of India presented the reverse of the shield. Four years ago, addressing a large audience in the city of Bombay, he pointed out that they in India had to pay a very large sum, amounting to something like 20 millions to the India Office, on account of what was called 'Home Charges', consisting of the liberal salaries and extravagant pensions paid to superannuated officials. He did not wish to go into the political aspect of the question just now. He was now more concerned with its economic aspect, and he desired to tell them that four years ago he pointed out this most significant and curious fact that the Indian exports exceeded by the sum of 20 millions, which was, as nearly as possible, the amount of those Home Charges to which he had referred; in other words, it amounted to this—that this *tribute* of 20 millions they had to pay was paid by the export of goods and commodities for which they in India received nothing whatever in the shape of imports. He said, therefore, that whether they looked at the facts and figures in regard to this country, or whether they enlarged their vision and extended their scope of investigation and examined the circumstances of other nations, they could not

but come to the conclusion that an increase of imports was not a sign of national decay but of growing wealth and prosperity.

Well, Gentlemen, I venture to think that what I said nearly 20 years ago before that British audience at Greenwich holds equally true at the present moment. History repeats itself, and we find that the same Mr. Chamberlain who betrayed his leader and split up the Liberal Party in 1885 is repeating the same process with the Conservative Party. We, in India, may look on complacently over the party conflict in England, but one or two questions remain to be answered by the advocates of this new fiscal policy.

Is Mr. Chamberlain prepared to include India in his scheme of an Imperial Zollverein? Judging by his earlier speeches, no one would imagine that this great statesman knew of the existence of a country like India, much less that it is a part of the British Empire or that it has an immensely larger population than the Colonies which he has taken under his wings. It was after having been repeatedly reminded by statesmen of the first rank that it suddenly dawned upon him at the very conclusion of his campaign that India was a factor which could not be altogether ignored even by Imperialists of the Birmingham School—we should also like to ask Mr. Chamberlain whether if preference is given to the wheat grower in Canada, the same preference is to be given to India, or whether Canadian wheat is to be protected against Indian wheat. But although we here as well as his critics in England may go on repeating these questions till we are hoarse, the Birmingham Sphinx is not at all likely to give us any reply; for one of his chief characteristics is an insolent contempt for all his opponents however high their personal and political reputation.

I am myself a staunch believer in the doctrines of Free Trade. But whatever my individual opinions may be, I am aware that a large body of opinion amongst my countrymen is in favour of protection as regards our own industries. And having regard to the fact that so many of our flourishing industries were deliberately killed by heavy excise duties, Free Trader as I am on principle, I

have scarcely the heart to oppose my fellow-countrymen when they ask for protection on behalf of our native industries. I shall, therefore, take leave of this subject by asking one question of Mr. Chamberlain and his followers.

PLAIN ISSUES

If you succeed in deluding the people of England and inducing them to adopt a suicidal protectionist policy, what answer will you return to our people when they desire their industries to be protected against Lancashire? Hitherto while England was herself pursuing the policy of Free Trade, your arm-chair politicians were able to console their consciences by saying :

We believe in Free Trade. We allow free imports into Great Britain and Ireland, and we as trustees for the Indian Empire cannot approve of your adopting a policy which we ourselves believe to be wrong and when we offer the best proof of the sincerity of our convictions by showing that we are sincere Free Traders and allow goods from every foreign country to come into our country without any protective duties.

That was all very fine in the old days. But if Mr. Chamberlain wins, shall we not be able to say in reply, you the people of England in your simplicity have "lent a too credent ear" to the siren voice of the Birmingham tempter, and now that you have done so, when every rag of hypocrisy has been stripped off your backs and you stand exposed before the world in all the nakedness of your selfish policy, with what countenance will you undertake to justify your policy in India? One of your Anglo-Indian newspapers, the *Calcutta Statesman*, has taken the measure of this Birmingham Politician. In 1884 when Mr. Chamberlain was one of the shining lights of the Radical Party, and I was a Parliamentary candidate, I freely acknowledged him as one of my leaders. I shall, therefore, abstain from saying anything myself inconsistent with our old relationship and only make an extract from the *Statesman* newspaper giving a faithful description of Mr. Chamberlain and his political programme :

Mr. Chamberlain has the faculty of overpowering the common sense of his audiences; otherwise they would hardly allow him to continue the repetition of such astonishing folly. The

character of the eminent campaigner's economics is already familiar but hitherto we have not been made acquainted with any examples of his reading of history. Now that we are privileged to catch a glimpse of it, we can merely marvel at its impertinence and wonder what may be coming next As for Mr. Chamberlain's claim that he can provide work and wages for all, there seems nothing for it but to take refuge in a remark which we find in the *Economist*: 'The egotism of the man is growing really stupendous.'

PAX BRITANNICA

Incidentally in connection with the Fiscal Question. I have alluded to the annual drain on the resources of this country. Now, Gentlemen, I shall ask your leave to point out in somewhat more detail the abuses of the increasing poverty of our country. A political critic or reformer has always a difficult task before him. His is not a bed of roses. The very fact of his finding fault with the existing state of things arrays all the vested interests against him. Even disinterested Englishmen are inclined to start with a prejudice against those who are not full of unqualified admiration for the acts and the policy of their countrymen in India. Still we have the consolation of feeling that many who came to scoff have remained to bless and thanks to the efforts of the Congress, and the labours of some of our large-hearted English friends such as Mr. Digby, to whom we can never be sufficiently grateful, we have the mournful satisfaction of knowing that we have succeeded in convincing a large portion of the English people that India is no longer the Eldorado which many yet pretend it is, but that it is a land of ever-increasing poverty where the masses of the people hardly ever have an adequate meal during the 24 hours of the day from year's end to year's end.

It has been said by men who ought to have known better that India is the lightest taxed country in the world in spite of the clearest evidence that the tax per head in England amounted to 7 per cent. of the income of the people, but in India it was according to one calculation 11 per cent. and according to another, that is, taking 20 rupees as the annual income per head, it was no less than 14 per cent. i.e., double that of the English people—the richest

nation in the world. It is also deliberately ignored that Lord Mayo more than 30 years ago declared that the utmost limits of taxation had been reached in this country, a statement more than once re-affirmed by responsible statesmen. Apart from the normal poverty of our people when we draw the attention of the Government to the ever-recurring famines and their increasing severity, we are officially told that famines are acts of God and attributable only to want of rainfall. To those who, as rulers of this vast country, are entrusted with irresponsible powers over the destinies of 300 millions of human beings, it may be very satisfactory to assign to Divine power and the operations of Nature, the consequences of their own short-sighted policy, but they cannot expect independent and intelligent observers to accept their interested and specious statements. Even officials of high rank and Anglo-Indian newspapers which ordinarily support the Government and are known to be its demi-official organs have been obliged from time to time to admit that the policy of the Government in the progressive increase of the land-tax is a potent factor in the increasing frequency and severity of our famines. Referring to the fact that from the time the dominions of the Mahratta sovereign came under British rule in 1817, to the year 1823, that is to say within a period of six years, the assessment was nearly doubled being raised from 80 lakhs to 150 lakhs. The Bombay Government in its Administration Report for 1892-93 thus describes the operations of that period:

OFFICIAL CONDEMNATION

Every effort was made—lawful and unlawful—to get the utmost out of the wretched peasantry, who were subjected to torture—in some instances cruel and revolting beyond description—if they could not or would not yield what was demanded. Numbers abandoned their homes and fled into neighbouring Native States; large tracts of land were thrown out of cultivation, and in some districts no more than a third of the cultivated area remained in occupation.

One of the most conservative of English journals, speaking of the condition of these ryots, said:—

Stupidity, blindness, indifference, greed—inability, in a word, in all its thousand forms—settled down, like the fabled harpies on the ryot's bread and bore off with them all that he subsisted upon.

Coming down to more recent times, we find that in 1893 the Hon. Mr. Rogers, member of the Bombay Council, stated as follows:—

In the 11 years from 1879-80, to 1880-90 there were sold by auction for the collection of land revenue the occupancy rights of 1,963,364 acres of land held by 840,713 defaulters in addition to personal property of the value of Rs 29,65,081. Of the 1,963,364 acres, 1,174,143 had to be bought in on the part of the Government for want of bidders, that is to say, very nearly 60 per cent. of the land supposed to be fairly and equitably assessed could not find purchasers.

Could there be any more scathing condemnation of this system of taxation? Passing from Bombay to Madras, we are confronted with similar merciless enhancement of taxation? The *Calcutta Englishman*, the leading Anglo-Indian newspaper of this country, wrote as follows:—

The late Madras famine has raised the question as to what the Government has done to protect the agriculture of Southern India in return for the revenue raised from it. . . . Twenty years of British rule have increased the Government demand upon the agriculture of Madras by over one million, or one-third of the whole land revenue paid by the Presidency to the Company in 1858. There are not wanting those who affirm that this increased taxation had much to do with the late calamity. The husbandmen were less able according to this view, to bear the strain of bad seasons, in consequence of the enormous increase in the revenue taken from them.

Well, Gentlemen, let us turn now for one moment to the state of things in the Central Provinces. Only about a year ago, the Hon'ble Mr. B. K. Bose, a member of the Supreme Council, made the following statement from his place in Council:—

Proceedings with a view to a second new settlement are also in progress in Bilaspur and Raipore. The Districts, especially the former were very hard hit during the last famine. They are no less so this time. They were both newly assessed about ten years ago. The enhancement in Bilaspur was 102 per cent. in some cases and 105 per cent. in others.

It is important to note that this remarkable statement remained unchallenged. In Bengal, thanks to the Permanent Settlement of Lord Cornwallis, we are somewhat better off than our compatriots in other parts of India. But even in Bengal, attempts are every now and again made to bring about a reversal of Lord Cornwallis' policy but since an open and direct reversal would be attended with serious difficulties, indirect encroachments upon the spirit and letter of the Permanent Settlement are made by the imposition of new taxes upon the land such as the chowkidari tax, the road cess and the public works cess.

PROMOTION—BY RESULT SETTLEMENTS

Disparaging references are also made to our Mughal Emperors. But there again they forget that those rulers were not birds of passage like our English officials but the revenue which they gathered from the people—and theirs' was a very elastic system favourably contrasting with the system of which we now complain—was spent in the country and the money circulating among the children of the soil remained and fructified in the country. But what is the case now with our English rulers? The revenue is wrung from the pockets of our people but the savings of English officials, both civil and military as well as their ample pensions, are spent for the benefit of their native land. The elastic modes of the Mughal and the Mahratta have given place to a cast-iron system worked by a host of highly paid and "promotion-by-result" settlement officers. The most recent result of the present system was prominently brought to the notice of Lord Curzon by the Hon. Mr. Smeaton in his speech at the Viceregal Council. He pointed out that according to the accounts of 1900-1901, the collections in Bombay, the Punjab and Madras were 60 lakhs in excess of the previous year which was a year of famine and these 60 lakhs were largely the arrears for that year which Mr. Smeaton declared "*should not have been demanded at all*".

"And this," he added, "brought to his mind a very vital question lately raised, whether the *intensity* of recent famines is, or is not, *largely due* to poverty caused by the operation of our land revenue system as a whole."

Gentlemen, I may observe here parenthetically that candid language like that of Mr. Smeaton is not very highly appreciated by our Government, and whether it be a mere unfortunate coincidence or whether it was owing to his opinions not finding much favour in high quarters, it is quite certain that just at the time when the public expected that he would succeed to the Lieutenant-Governorship of Burma, an extension was granted to Sir F. Fryer just long enough to oblige Mr. Smeaton to retire from the service under the 35 years' rule.

Even the ordinary Government organ, the *Pioneer*, was compelled to say that the fact that "in the Supreme Council, Mr. Smeaton has always given his opinion fearlessly and independently ought to have told in his favour rather than against him".

Well, Gentlemen, I have already called your attention to the poverty of our country and as regards the evidence I have mostly relied upon the testimony of high English officials. And not only have I relied on their testimony but I have based my conclusions on the inexorable logic of facts. If when in Bombay out of 1,963,364 acres of land held by defaulters had to be sold by auction, no less than 1,174,143 acres had to be bought in for want of bidders, what did that mean? It simply meant this: that the land was too heavily taxed to be worth buying. If the taxation had been equitable and there had been a reasonable chance of deriving even a poor and miserable pittance from the cultivation of those lands, do you think there would have been any lack of purchasers? Well, then, Gentlemen, according to all the available evidence, India is one of the poorest countries in the world. We have seen how the English Civilian Officials through their extravagant pay and pensions and compensation for exchange and furlough allowances, drain the resources of the country. But if even after meeting their demands we might have had any vitality left, the military service steps in with all the inhumanly selfish policy of the British War Office, shamelessly supported by the Secretary of State for India and sucks the life-blood of this country. I have never

been slow to acknowledge the benefits conferred upon us by the British Government, so much so that no less an authority than the late John Bright, after the meeting in Willis's Rooms in 1879 himself assured me that the only portion of my speech of which he did not approve was where, to use his own words, he thought I was endeavouring "to sugar the pill". But, Gentlemen, while none of us is insensible to those benefits, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that whenever British interests clash with ours, India is certain to kick the beam. Our Anglo-Indian friends, therefore, should not be surprised if the policy and means of our Government do not always command our unqualified admiration or render us inclined to fall down on our knees to offer our thanks to heaven for the wisdom and benevolence of our rulers. I have already referred to the tendency of some persons when they are worsted in argument to take refuge in some high sounding phrase especially if it is veiled in the obscurity of a learned language, and to consider it almost an act of blasphemy on your part if you do not immediately raise the white flag and surrender at discretion. Such is the case with the defenders of the extreme party of our Anglo-Indian bureaucracy. Argument and logic are not their *forte*, and, therefore, whenever they are pushed to a corner they appeal with an air of triumph to the Latin phrase, "*Pax Britannica*". We all unhesitatingly admit that this *Pax Britannica* has undoubtedly put an end to the anarchy and internecine wars which prevailed here during the declining days of the Mughal Empire. But if, now-a-days we are free from the ravages of lawless hordes, if we are no longer subject to the pillage and rapine and slaughter, of domestic strife and struggles for ascendancy between rival princes and chiefs, we cannot forget that there is another side to the balance sheet. After all it makes but little difference whether millions of lives are lost on account of war and anarchy or whether the same result is brought about by famine and starvation.

A REFLEX JINGOISM

The Jingo fever which has swept over England during the past few years has had its baneful results in this

country. When the British Government on the initiative of Mr. Chamberlain, who has been the evil genius of the Empire for so many years, after having embarked upon the Boer War with a light heart, which reminds one of the notorious declaration to the French War Secretary just before the Franco-Prussian War that "the Army was ready, aye, ready to a button"—I say, when the British Government discovered that he had entered upon a really serious and extremely costly affair, they endeavoured, in accordance with former precedents, to make India the scapegoat and in defiance of Law and Justice to throw the burden of the War upon our unhappy and unrepresented people. I am glad to think that some of the leading Anglo-Indian journals, who do not always see eye to eye with us, raised their influential voice on our behalf. *Capital*, the organ of English mercantile men in Calcutta, made the following forcible observations:—

It seems that the Home Government proposed to foist upon the Indian people a charge of £786,000 in the shape of additional pay to the British soldiers stationed in this country. This increase of pay has been the result of the war in South Africa, where troops from India saved the situation in Natal in the early part of the conflict—a conflict with which the Indian people had nothing whatever to do, and in a country too, where the natives of this Empire are denied the full rights of citizenship, and where a Hindu has actually been fined for walking on the pavement. The Indian Government should resist this impost tooth and nail.

Gentlemen we cannot be too thankful to my friend, Mr. Shirley Tremearne, Editor of the *Capital*, for this spirited protest and for the admirable impartiality with which he discusses public questions. But then, as Mr. C. J. O'Donnell says, the Indian Government has no tooth or nail except for the native taxpayer.

Capital went on to say:—

There is another charge that is to be hung round our necks, if Lord Curzon's Government is weak enough to submit to it, *viz.*, a sum of £548,000 being £7-10s. for every soldier sent to India as the cost price of recruiting him. A more unjust imposition could not be made, and it is one which could only be thrust upon a people having no representative institution. The British Army is raised at Home for Imperial purposes. A regiment may have seen years

of service in other parts of Greater Britain before it comes to India, and yet it is proposed to charge the original recruiting and training charges of the soldiers to the Indian Exchequer. The whole thing is ridiculous.

TIBET AND PERSIA

No less an authority than the late Mr. Fawcett pointed out many years ago that, by a mere change in the service and transport system and without reducing the strength of the Army by a single man, it was possible to effect a reduction of at least three millions sterling in the military expenditure of this country. We also know that the late Mr. Caine repeatedly pointed out that the strength of the British Army in India was far in excess of what was necessary for purely Indian purposes. This statement is often challenged, but the London *Standard*, the leading Tory newspaper, which can never be suspected of any pro-Indian proclivities and least of all, in military matters, has unexpectedly come to our support. It declared not long ago that Ladysmith has been defended by regiments brought from India; that Indian troops had relieved the Legations of Peking; that during the South African War over 13,000 British Officers and men had been sent there from India accompanied by more than 9,000 followers and attendants. Thirteen hundred British Officers and men and 20,000 Native troops together with more than 17,000 camp followers were sent to China. After giving these figures which speak for themselves, the *Standard* exultingly exclaims: "Such is the scale on which India at the shortest notice and without dislocating her establishment can contribute towards the military capabilities of the Empire beyond her own frontiers." When such a high Jingo authority has stated our case in as clear and forcible language as we could have desired to use ourselves, let not lesser Jingo in this country presume to question the truth of the statement that the military establishment of India is far in excess of our own requirements.

Before leaving this subject of military extravagance, I desire to raise a warning voice against the pseudo-Imperialism which impels some of our prancing Pro-Consuls

to seek new adventures beyond our proper frontiers, whether in Afghanistan or in Burma; whether in the Forbidden Land of the Lamas or in another direction so close to the sphere of Russian influence as almost to invite a collision with that power. If we had an Irish Viceroy and if Persia had been an Oriental Donnybrook Fair, there might not, perhaps, have been anything so very incongruous in the Governor-General going to the shores of the Persian Gulf and inviting all and sundry to oblige him by treading on his coat tail.

There are some enterprises which might well be called a tempting of Providence. But if it be considered presumptuous on our part to protest against any enterprise however perilous and ill-conceived which a Jingo Ministry in England might be disposed to undertake, let it not be forgotten that under an Act of Parliament no portion of the Indian Army can be lawfully taken out of service beyond the proper frontiers of India without the previous consent of Parliament (*hear, hear*) and let it, at all events, be made clear to us that India is not to be saddled with any portion of the burdens which may be thrown on the Empire as the result of the vaulting ambition of vainglorious imperialists.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

I now pass on to the important question of the Administration of Justice and more particularly of Criminal Justice. Every one will admit that nothing is more calculated to create discontent and disaffection than the belief that justice is not evenly and impartially administered. It is equally unquestionable that it cannot be impartially administered if the functions of Prosecutor and Judge are combined in the same official. Therefore, it is that for some years past we have been asking for a complete separation of Executive from Judicial functions. The present combination of these two incompatible functions has been condemned by almost every one whose opinion is worth anything. Only in 1893, Sir R. Garth declared that the present anomalous position of the District Magistrate only

.

tempts him to use his influence and powers for a good many improper purposes, which however much they may have been countenanced by high civilian officials, have deservedly incurred the odium of the public and brought disgrace on the Indian Administration.

But, Gentlemen, it is no longer necessary to fortify ourselves with the opinions of high judicial authorities like Sir R. Garth, Sir B. Peacock, Sir R. Couch, Lord Hobhouse and a host of other distinguished persons, for the justice of our contention has been admitted in the most emphatic terms by more than one Viceroy and more than one Secretary of State for India. But the capacity for passive resistance of the Indian Civil Service is unlimited, and when beaten all along the line on the merits of the question, they have still managed to shelve this urgent reform by deluding successive Viceroys and Secretaries of State into the belief that it would involve doubling the cost of administration. The Anglo-Indian bureaucracy is not easily baffled. A Viceroy, however well-intentioned and strong-minded, can rarely resist the steady pressure of his Civilian *entourage*, and especially on questions of administrative detail, he is naturally inclined to place implicit reliance upon the officials who have had long personal experience of the working of that administration. Then as to the Secretary of State, he is equally well-guarded by a band of Anglo-Indian fossils who take good care that he should be nothing more than their mouth-piece. Thus it is, that driven from all their positions of vantage, they have now taken refuge in their last entrenchment—financial difficulty. Lord Kimberley, who was strongly convinced of the merits of this reform, was told that it would mean doubling the staff throughout the country. His predecessor, Lord Cross, similarly deceived by the same group of ancient fossils, said in the House of Lords that this reform which in his opinion would be an excellent one, resulting in vast good to the Government of India, could not possibly be carried out in the existing state of Indian finances. But, Gentlemen, fortunately we have had the good fortune of having some of our countrymen in the Indian Civil Service. Mr. R. C. Dutt, who had

attained the rank of a Commissioner of a Division, and who had filled the office of District Magistrate in most of the important districts of Bengal came forward with a weighty statement showing that the reform could be most easily carried out without increasing the cost of administration by a single rupee. Mr. Dutt's scheme has been before the authorities now for some years. He has mercilessly exposed the hypocrisy of this objection on financial grounds. Not one member of the Service of which he was so distinguished a member has ventured to enter the lists and measure swords with him. Therefore, we may take it that his statements cannot be answered. But nevertheless our Anglo-Indian officials know how to obstruct the most urgently-needed reform. That they should do so, while mediocrity or worse than mediocrity was in office, during the days of Lord George Hamilton, is nothing to be wondered at. But we had a right to expect better things from a statesman of Lord Curzon's reputation and strength of mind.

EUROPEANS AND INDIANS

Then again, what about the burning question of justice as between Europeans and Indians? But as this is a most delicate matter, involving racial questions, in regard to which my own statements may not be credited with the impartiality and freedom from exaggeration with which it is my highest ambition to approach the discussion of all controversial questions, I prefer to rest our case on the deliberate admissions of English officials of high position and long experience who cannot be suspected of any undue bias against their own countrymen. With this object I shall ask your leave to read an extract from the speech of a recently retired English member of the Covenanted Civil Service who has filled some of the highest official positions in this country. I refer to Sir Henry Cotton who, as you all know, was Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Member of the Viceregal Council, and Chief Commissioner of Assam and who, in all probability, would have been Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal if his conscientious and outspoken

opinions, like those of Mr. Smeaton, had not placed him out of the running. Sir H. Cotton speaking at a recent meeting in London stated as follows :—

When Englishmen were put upon their trial for these crimes what was the general result? In the great majority of cases it could only be described as a judicial scandal. He was not particularly anxious that anyone should find his way to the gallows but he was bound to say that there were innumerable cases in which men charged with most brutal murders for which no other punishment than hanging was suitable had escaped through the failure to administer justice fairly and fully. Why was that? In the first place, these offenders were tried by a jury of their own countrymen. It was, of course, a very sound principle in law that a man should be tried by his peers and equals, but it was hardly necessary for him to point out that in a country like India where Englishmen were widely scattered, and where one of them, say a tea planter was charged with causing the death of an unfortunate cooly, and was arraigned before other tea planters in the same position as himself, it was natural and even inevitable that the jury should be biased and should find the accused guilty of the smallest cognisable offence under the law—*viz*, simple hurt—for which a fine of a few rupees was only imposed. Decisions of that kind did not commend themselves to the judgment of the Natives of India and in consequence a strong and bitter feeling was aroused by such cases. Suppose that the Government interfered and took up the prosecution, the result might be the infliction of a term of imprisonment instead of the imposition of fine, but immediately that happened, a storm of protest was raised, the greatest anger and indignation were given vent to at every European breakfast table and tea table and no stone was left unturned to get the sentence either cancelled or modified. That was one of the chief difficulties under which the Indian administration laboured. No responsible Governor was anxious to face the wrath and anger of his own countrymen, however keen he might be to administer justice as between man and man. It required, in fact, more than ordinary courage for the heads of the Government to preserve an even tone and temper in dealing with these cases. Lord Curzon was undoubtedly animated by a high sense of justice, and he had used his best efforts to see that justice was done in these cases. He had instructed his officials to watch them carefully, and to report on them to the Government, but he regretted to say that as a result of the recent agitation, his Lordship had stated that he had at no time, whether publicly or privately, officially, or semi-officially, issued any instructions which would affect the administration of justice as between Englishmen and Natives. In other words, he had withdrawn from the field, and had given rise to the impression that his previous action had been misunderstood. That was very much to be regretted.

Gentlemen, it is impossible to add to the force of this weighty pronouncement. Sir H. Cotton concludes by pointing out that it was not very easy for Judges and Magistrates to maintain an attitude of strict fairness and impartiality in India, for they were in isolated positions and possibly in many cases their only companions were the very men they were called upon to try. I shall only venture to emphasise the truth of this last statement by a reference to two recent cases showing how even English judicial officers go to the wall when they try to hold the scales of justice evenly, and executive members of their own Service come out triumphant even when they try to muddle the fountain of justice at its very source. A few years ago, a Sessions Judge in one of the Behar districts administered even-handed justice between a native of India and some English officials. The District Magistrate and even the Commissioner of the Division took the part of the English official. What was the result? The Judge became a marked man and was transferred to a distant district. I will not refer to his ultimate fate, for that was complicated by other circumstances as to which it may perhaps be said that the Judge did not exercise the sound discretion that might have been expected. But how about the Executive officers connected with the case? I do not remember if the District Magistrate was considered worthy of immediate promotion, but we all know that the Divisional Commissioner to whom I have already referred so far from being blamed for his part in the affair, was a few years afterwards promoted to the highest office to which any member of the Indian Civil Service may aspire. The second case is equally instructive. I refer to the Rajshaye Mohurrun case. In that case some poor Mahomedans had complained before the District Magistrate that they had been ill-treated by the District Superintendent of Police, but the Magistrate summarily dismissed their complaint and directed their own prosecution on a charge of bringing a false and malicious prosecution. The Sessions Judge endeavoured to do justice to these poor men but with disastrous results to himself. Not only did the Executive Government promptly transfer him to a notoriously

unhealthy district but he was even snubbed by a Division Bench of the High Court which I regret to say is no longer what it used to be. Well, Gentlemen, having regard to all these circumstances, I have no hesitation in saying that for my part I am growing more and more hopeless as to the prospects of obtaining justice when crimes of violence are committed by Englishmen or Eurasians against the children of the soil, unless the British Parliament thinks fit to take up this question in earnest and deal with it boldly.

RUSSIANISING THE STATUTE BOOK

Apart from the question of the actual Administration of Justice, we are every now and again threatened with new laws or amendments of old Acts, that are more worthy of Russian than of British legislators. To begin with, it should never be forgotten, and we should never be tired of reminding the British nation that while the scandal of *lettres de cachet* was abolished in France in 1789 amid public rejoicing, the representatives of the English people, who pride themselves upon being the eldest sons of Liberty introduced the ancient and hateful engine of oppression into this country in 1818 and 1821. Nor has it been suffered to remain idle and forgotten. Only a few years ago, two prominent citizens of Poona were laid by the heels and kept in confinement for a considerable period without any charge being formulated or any prospect of their being brought to trial before any judicial tribunal. Would any Government have dared to do such a thing in the British Isles? If it had, it would have been the beginning of the end so far as that administration was concerned. Simultaneously with the arbitrary imprisonment of the Nattu Brothers, we had a Sedition Act of Draconian severity passed in a great hurry as if the country was in the throes of a revolution, and a number of political prosecutions instituted, and the Judges being also in a state of panic, several well known and respected citizens were convicted of charges of which not one of their fellow-countrymen believed them to be guilty. One of these unfortunate victims, on presenting himself before the Calcutta Congress

of 1901, received a splendid ovation which showed that in the opinion of his fellow-countrymen he was a persecuted martyr and not a culprit. Well, Gentlemen, we had just begun to hope that the dark clouds of those days of panic had rolled by, when the Government of Lord Curzon has thrown another bombshell in our midst, by the proposed amendment of the Official Secrets Bill. One of these precious amendments proposes, contrary to every maxim of civilized jurisprudence, to throw the burden of proof upon the accused person, in other words the prosecution is relieved of the duty of giving evidence in support of its charges so that the accused person must be convicted almost automatically if he cannot prove the negative proposition, *viz.*, that he is not guilty. Mr. Arundel with the *naivete* so characteristic of Anglo-Indian officials, declares that under the old Act there were difficulties in the way of obtaining convictions. Mr. Arundel is a genius. He has been the first to discover the method of securing convictions automatically. After this it is hardly worth while to refer to other amendments such as that which seeks to gratify the *amour propre* of the Executive officers by placing the petty secrets of their offices, such as the projected promotion by favour of a particular official over the heads of worthier men, on the same level with important Military and Naval secrets the divulgence of which may be fraught with great and perhaps fatal danger to the Empire. No wonder that this proposal of the Government has been too much even for its most steady supporters among the conservative Anglo-Indian Press. I desire to express our special thanks to the Calcutta *Englishman*, which true to its British instincts, has made a vigorous protest against this Bill which it described as a deliberate attempt to Russianise public affairs. Gentlemen, we freely admit that Military and Naval secrets should be safeguarded against espionage, but apart from those matters, to me it is inexplicable why the Government of India, although it has always at its head a statesman brought up in the free and healthy atmosphere of England, should display such strong impatience of criticism and such a morbid antipathy against the liberty of the Press. If they are confident in the justice

of their proceedings, why should they not be able to say like Maitre Labori on a well known occasion, *Nous voulons la lumiere, toutela lumiere?* (We want light: we court all possible light.) A just and honest administration has nothing to lose by courting publicity and criticism. A great historian and eminent statesman of the last century tells us that

the Press may have absolute freedom without danger; truth alone is formidable; whatever is false is powerless; and the greater the exaggeration the weaker its effect. No Government has ever yet been overthrown by lies. A week's exaggeration and lies exhaust all the pens of pamphleteers and libellers; Governments have only to allow them to declaim. But a Government requires time and philosophy before it is prepared to admit these truths.

Well, Gentlemen, when will our Government acquire philosophy enough to admit these truths? Viceroy and Governors of different schools succeed one another, but with a few bright exceptions, such as Lord Ripon, they all seem to accept the vicious tradition of repressive legislation as one of the unquestioned axioms of statecraft.

NO TORY EDUCATION

Gentlemen, the subject of education is not second in importance to any other. Not long ago the whole country was convulsed over the Report of the Universities Commission which plainly showed a determination to deprive a large portion of our middle classes of the benefits of high education in this country and also to abolish the private educational institutions which had gradually grown up around our Universities. It was well known that the majority of the Commission only echoed the ideas which the Viceroy had put forth in a speech of his. With his Lordship's Tory and aristocratic ideas, he wanted to make our educational institutions approach as nearly as possible the standard of Eton and Oxford. It was naturally difficult for him to understand why poor men (such as the majority of our middle classes happen to be) should be anxious to receive a sort of education which poor people's children in England do not aspire to receive. Fortunately, however, there was among the members of the

Commission a distinguished Hindu gentleman, Mr. Justice Guru Dass Banerji, who perceived the danger of the situation and wrote an elaborate and convincing dissentient minute. It is, however, a matter for congratulation that the Government has already made several concessions. We are glad to feel that our indigenous colleges are not to be destroyed by a stroke of the pen and that our meritorious students of limited means are not to be excluded from the benefits of higher education by the devise of raising the fees and abolishing the private colleges. It may be all very fine for the scions of the English aristocracy, brought up in the lap of luxury, to imagine that it is only they and men like them who are fit to receive the advantages of higher education which they themselves have received in Eton or Rugby, in Oxford or Cambridge. For our part we cannot help remembering that some of our most distinguished men who were the first to be honoured by the Government itself with the highest offices ever yet attained by any native of India—we cannot help remembering that these men would have never occupied the positions that they did if the difficulties now sought to be thrown in the path of poor students had existed at the time when they were students in our schools and colleges.

Gentlemen, I take it that there can be no more important national question than the question of education. Let us, therefore, lay down the principles by which that question should be governed. Subject to your approval, I desire to lay down the following principles: Firstly, the education of the people should be as much as possible in the hands of the people; secondly, the popular control over our educational institutions should not be lightly interfered with until it has been plainly shewn that popular control has been found altogether a failure. Now our chief criticism and opposition to this Bill must be concentrated on that clause which does away with the present constitution of the Senate which is now independent of the Government because although the Fellows are almost all nominated by the Government, yet by reason of

the tenure of their office being for life, they are practically independent. This Bill, however, strikes a blow at their independence because the vast majority of Fellows are to be nominated by the Government and only for five years. So that their renomination must, to a large extent, depend upon how far they may have succeeded in ingratiating themselves into the good graces of the Government.

APRES MOI LE DELUGE

If members of the Covenanted Civil Service, so high in standing and position, as Mr. Smeaton and Sir H. Cotton could be deprived of their legitimate reward simply because they had the courage to declare their conscientious convictions how could the members of the Senate expect a better fate? It is true that the Bill proposes that a small number of Fellows should be elected by the graduates, but in our opinion they will be far too few to give the Senate a popular character. I think you will also agree with me that the qualification of the electors as proposed by the Bill is extremely limited and that it ought to extend to all who are graduates. Mr. Raleigh has been good enough to assure us that at some future time the principle of election might be extended. That is exactly the sort of promise that Anglo-Indian officials are always fond of making. All concessions of a substantial nature they very complacently leave to their successors as if they unconsciously sympathised with the sentiment bluntly expressed by that typical despot, Louis XIV, when he said "*Apres moi le deluge*". So far back as the year 1860, Sir Bartle Frere, while leaving to District Magistrates a combination of Judicial and Executive functions, held out a hope that at no distant future this anomaly might be removed. More than 40 years have gone by and yet that hope has not been realised. Therefore, as regards Mr. Raleigh's statement, we would much rather have a better recognition of the elective principle at the present moment than a promise to be realised at some uncertain future period. Such, therefore, are our objections to this Bill. We want as little Government control as possible. We do not want difficulties to be put in the way of our poorer students. We are glad to find that

the suggestion as to the raising of the fees has been abandoned; but if I may be permitted without derogating from the dignity of the occasion to use a homely saying I would remind you that "there are more ways of killing a cat than stuffing it with cream". We do not want our indigenous colleges to be harrassed by undue interference. While we are prepared to welcome any reasonable and well-considered reforms as regards the health, morality and education of our students, we do not want the aristocratic standard of Eton and Oxford to be established in this poor country.

COMPULSORY FREE EDUCATION

But, Gentlemen, let us not confine our attention to High Education alone. We have a sacred duty towards the poorer classes of our people. Those of us who have received the benefits of High Education are bound, whatever may be in our power, to extend the blessings of education, so far as may be, to the masses of our people. Let us remember the simple but eloquent words of the late Mr. John Bright that "the nation in every country dwells in the cottage". Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that we should have some system of primary vernacular instruction, like the Board Schools in England whereby the dwellers in the cottage and the sons of the soil may be brought more in touch with the more fortunate classes of their countrymen. Do not let us forget that wherever the masses of the people are steeped in ignorance there is always a double danger, firstly of their being entirely apathetic towards all questions affecting the welfare of the country and, secondly, of their being liable to be excited beyond reasonable bounds by unscrupulous or fanatical agitators. In all European countries, with perhaps the exception of Russia and Turkey, provision is made by the State for the free education of all its subjects. I was myself in England when the Board Schools were first introduced and I remember that even in that country the scheme was at first somewhat unpopular because it involved the compulsory attendance of children at School. But that feeling soon wore away, the English people came to recognise the

benefits of the institution and now there is hardly a single individual amongst the poorest classes who cannot read and write, and it is an ordinary spectacle to see even the cab drivers regularly buying a daily newspaper and reading it while waiting for a fare on the stand. It is the system of compulsory free education which has rendered it possible for representatives of the working classes to enter the British House of Commons and to hold their own against those who by birth were more fortunately situated. I have cited the case of England as I am more familiar with its politics, but the same thing may be said *mutatis mutandis* of most countries of Europe and the United States of America. Coming nearer home, we have seen what wonderful results have been achieved in Japan by the introduction of the same system of compulsory free education. If, therefore, all progressive nations have found it necessary to adopt this system to keep abreast of the times, is it too much to ask our people to take up this question in earnest? I am sure that on mature consideration all our thoughtful men will agree that this reform is very much to be desired and I am equally sure that if we approach the Government with any degree of unanimity and ask for some tentative measure in this direction, the Government itself will be glad to respond to our wishes. I shall only add that the enlightened ruler of Baroda has already set an example in this direction which British India might well follow.

But, Gentlemen, while it is the duty of a civilised and enlightened Government to give all reasonable facilities for both primary and higher education, let us not forget that we have corresponding duties of our own. Perhaps the rising generation will not consider it presumptuous on my part if I venture to remind them that, after all, the best of educational institutions and the most ideal of Universities can only furnish us with a pass-key to the temple of Knowledge. But whether that key is to grow rusty in our pockets, or whether we are to make use of it to open the portals of that sacred Fane, in order to hold communion with the immortal dead and to take possession of the

priceless legacy left to us by the mighty men of old, depends entirely upon ourselves. Think you, Gentlemen, that our own classical poets, that Homer and Virgil, that Shakespeare and Milton, that Dante and Tasso, that Corneille and Racine who surpassing the wonders of the Arabian Nights have left to us works which, after the lapse of many centuries, still stand out to the eyes of the initiated like pictures bright with "colours dipt in Heaven"—think you that these men "who though dead, deathless all," lived and worked only for their own generation and for the circumscribed geographical limits of their own native land? No, Gentlemen, they were cosmopolitan in the truest sense of the word. They lived and worked and died for the entire human race. The rich legacy they have left behind is a legacy for all nations and for all posterity.

THANKING THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT

Just before leaving Calcutta for Madras, I received a wire from the Dacca People's Association asking me to enlist on their behalf your sympathy to encourage them in the protest against the absorption of Dacca and Mymensingh by Assam. Hitherto, Assam has been considered a most backward administration, but Dacca and Mymensingh form two of the most advanced districts in Bengal. You can, therefore, quite understand that Dacca does not appreciate the tender solicitude of the Government when they are requested to give up their advantages to oblige Assam.

I understand, Gentlemen, that you too have a grievance of such an important nature that it may fitly be called a national question involving as it does the principle of Self-Government. I refer to the retrograde and reactionary Madras Municipal Bill which is before your Legislative Council. Under ordinary circumstances, one would have thought that the Government of Madras would have benefited by the extraordinary financial disclosure in the Calcutta Municipal accounts, by no less an authority than the Government auditors whose impartiality is above

suspicion. Such have been the results in Calcutta of the boasted reform introduced by Sir Alexander Mackenzie. Gentlemen, the Madras Municipal Bill has taken the Calcutta Bill with all its deficiencies as its model and is trying to concentrate in a few the power which should really belong to the representatives of the majority of the rate-payers. I am, therefore, not surprised that the proposal has evoked such strong opposition on your part.

Gentlemen, I shall touch on one subject more before I conclude, *viz*, the industrial movement which is of such vital importance to our nation; and although I have left the subject to the last, it is by no means the least. Day before yesterday, one of our most advanced princes opened the Industrial Exhibition which is such a useful adjunct of the Congress, and here on behalf of the people of India let me in the most cordial manner thank the Government of Lord Amphill for the substantial gift it has made to the Exhibition Fund. I have always been strong in my belief that our industries form the best of all political levers. Once we rear up large industries in India (you must distinguish it from exploitation by foreign capital) in which the interest not only of the capitalist but that of the wage-earner and consumer is to be safeguarded, you may be sure that three-fourths of our battle of reform is won, for the power of the purse is by far the greatest of all powers.

Gentlemen, if I were to attempt to do full justice to all the questions in which we are interested, it would require a great deal more time than I should be justified in taking up. As it is, I find that I have exceeded the length which I had prescribed for myself. The Congress has now been in existence for 19 years, during which we have had our days of sunshine as well as our days of storm. It has been said that the Congress represents after all a "microscopic minority". Although this statement was first made several years ago, it is still echoed from time to time by those who are determined to disparage that movement and hold it up to ridicule. Perhaps they will be surprised to learn that an illustrious writer whose works

have already occupied a prominent position in the classical literature of modern Europe has said, speaking of a country in the van of European civilization, that :

It is only the *elite* of a nation who are alive to the sentiments of glory and liberty, who appreciate noble and generous ideas and are ready to make sacrifices for them. The masses of the people desire quiet and repose, except when they are stirred up by deep and mighty passions.

I may venture to follow up these pregnant words by adding that inasmuch as history teaches us that opinion always percolates from the higher to the lower strata of society, the ideas of the educated minority to-day are bound to be shared by the masses to-morrow, it is the duty of all far-sighted statesmen to take time by the forelock and by the concession of well-considered reforms to ensure the contentment of the people and to enhance their loyalty and affection for the Government. At the same time we must not forget that a great deal depends on ourselves ; for no nation has ever yet attained any position of importance by merely relying on the favours of the Government. There are many matters as to which, whether the Government is willing to help us or not, we ourselves can do a great deal, such for instance as the education of the masses of our people. Let us remember that if we are ever to acquire those rights and privileges which we all desire, the stimulus and the motive power must come from ourselves, and above all let us not forget that we can never hope to realise our aspirations unless the Congress, fully sensible of its duties towards the masses of our people, so shapes its policy as to bring them into line with us. If I might venture to address you in the eloquent language which Virgil puts into the mouth of the Sibyll, I would say that :

Had I a hundred mouths, a hundred tongues,
A voice of brass and adamantine lungs,

I could even then hardly hope to make a sufficiently impassioned appeal to you as regards the vital importance of educating our masses. We cannot forget that unfortunately our Government by the introduction of a policy of

promiscuous distribution of titles encourages sycophancy and subservience amongst some of our wealthy people. That is the very reason why some of our titled folks, forgetting their duty to their country, are ever ready to perform servile genuflexions before every official clothed in brief authority. We are, however, glad to find that several of the flower of our aristocracy have risen superior to selfish considerations, and with admirable patriotism have come forward to place themselves at the head of the people whose natural leaders, their rank and position, justly entitle them to be.

A WELCOME RAPPROACHEMENT

Gentlemen, in dealing with the economic question, I have shown that a good portion of the Home Charges is represented by the pension and other liberal allowances made to Anglo-Indian officials in England. Is there any reason why this injustice should be perpetuated? Have we not a right to say to our Government, that by the policy inaugurated by some of the best of your statesmen you have given us the benefits of a liberal education and stimulated our personal and national aspirations? Is it not, therefore, your duty to open up a career for those whose legitimate ambition you yourselves have roused? If you deliberately choose to close every avenue to our legitimate aspirations, do you really think that you are strengthening the loyalty of the Indian people? Or does it not strike you if you have any of the sagacity and foresight of statesmen, that you are doing your best to sow discontent and disaffection amongst a people sincerely disposed to be loyal to British Rule? Speaking at a dinner of the National Liberal Club, on 20th February 1884, when the Right Hon'ble the Earl of Kimberley was the President, having to respond to the toast of Liberal administration in India proposed by Mr. Walter Wren, I said :

My Lord, in proportion as you pursue a policy of justice and provide a legitimate field for the gratification of our growing aspirations, you will place the loyalty of the Indian people on a firm and sure foundation ;

and, Gentlemen, I had the satisfaction of finding that that sentiment met with the unanimous approval of the cultured audience that I was then addressing.

Looking around us, I miss many of those who were such familiar figures in the Congress, and to whom so much of the success of the movement is due, but whom in the inevitable course of nature the Grim Ferryman, who spares neither prince nor peasant, has wafted across those dark waters from which there is no return. But I am glad to find that the rising generation is so well represented on this occasion ; for if Time is year by year depriving us of some of our most valued leaders, we have at least the consolation of knowing that our younger men are ready to take up with vigour the work commenced by the generation that is fast passing away. I remember to have read some years ago in Orme's *History of India*, that whatever we do, we do languidly. If there be any foundation for that opinion, the zeal and energy of our younger generation ought to go far towards wiping out that reproach, for even men like myself who can no longer lay any claim to youth, unconsciously feel ourselves almost rejuvenated when we come in contact with their exuberant enthusiasm. Young men of India, in you the hopes of our country are centred, and I cannot bring home to you the responsibilities which rest on you better than by repeating, with the alteration of two words only, the historical message sent from Ligny on the 16th June, 1815: "Gentlemen, the fate of India rests in your hands."

It is another hopeful sign of the times that there is an increasing *rapprochement* between Hindus and Mahomedans—a *rapprochement* happily emphasised this year by the fact that of all the men of light and leading of which Madras can boast, the Congress Party have selected you, Sir, to be the Chairman of the Reception Committee of our great national organisation. Our Mahomedan fellow-countrymen who may have at one time looked askance at the Congress, on account of the misrepresentations of those who are interested in dividing us, are now daily becoming more and more convinced that their interests

as well as ours can only be advanced if we heartily co-operate with each other. There may have been a time, Sir, when the East India Company found it necessary to adopt a policy which in a letter, addressed to your great ancestor, General Buonaparte well described as *diviser pour regner*. Happily we can now hope for better things, for we are no longer ruled by an irresponsible, unscrupulous and avaricious body of traders whose only object was to mercilessly exploit the country and whose rapacity and inhuman methods roused the indignation and fired the eloquence of Burke and Sheridan. Our Government is now under the control of Parliament, and we have the satisfaction of knowing that our destinies are linked with those of a nation that has ever been distinguished by its fervent love of liberty, proved not merely by their own political institutions but displayed on various occasions with rare generosity on behalf of distant and oppressed peoples. Although a British poet has sung :—

Did peace descend, to triumph and to save,
When free-born Britons, cross'd the Indian wave ?
Ah, no !—to more than Rome's ambition true,
The nurse of Freedom gave it not to you ?
She the bold route of Europe's guilt began,
And, in the march of nations led the van !

Still, for our part we prefer to cling to the belief that the English people are not barbarous conquerors, but that they are champions of liberty whose divine mission it is to rekindle the torch of genius in this ancient land of civilisation and to raise us once more to a position in some degree worthy of the greatness of our past history.

Twentieth Congress—Bombay—1904

SIR HENRY COTTON

INTRODUCTION

DELEGATES to the Indian National Congress, Ladies and Gentlemen, —It was well said by one of my predecessors in this Chair that the Presidency of the Indian National Congress was the greatest honour that could be conferred by the people of India on one of their own countrymen. (*Hear, hear.*) I feel that the honour is even greater when it is bestowed on one who is not of your own race or country. I have good reason to be proud of the position in which you have placed me this afternoon. Although I must always be aware that one of your own body would more worthily and adequately discharge the functions of the office (*no, no*), and am conscious that it must be more appropriate for an Indian to preside at the Indian National Congress than an Englishman, I received your invitation to come here as the highest compliment you could pay me, and accepted it not only with a deep sense of responsibility, but also of gratitude and pride in this notable and public recognition of the humble services I have been able to render to India. (*Applause.*)

CHARACTER OF THE CONGRESS

This is the twentieth annual session of the Indian National Congress, an organisation avowedly national in its name and scope. We meet for the furtherance and discussion of national interests. I see before me a vast number of delegates—the number is deliberately limited for convenience sake—representatives of every community, of every rank and profession, as well as religion—met

together as the political leaders of all parts of India. Here you are able to act in concert and to declare in no uncertain accents the common public opinion of the multitudes of whom you are the mouthpiece. You occupy a vantage-ground of no mean eminence. Here are the voice and brain of the country. Here, before me, are gathered the representative citizens of a great nation. Yours is a position which no failure in your projects and no neglect of your advice can nullify. You are assembled together—highly trained Zoroastrians, wealthy and energetic natives of Cutch and Guzarat, citizens of this splendid city who mould its destinies alike in commerce and in intellectual pursuits; brilliant and patriotic Mahrattas exulting in the glory of your past and your ancestors, Brahmins from Madras, with your keen and subtle intelligence; Babus from Bengal, strenuous and able, who rule and control public opinion from Peshawar to Chittagong; representatives from the Punjab and the United and Central Provinces; Hindus who are exercising an almost indescribable influence by virtue of the living Hinduism which lies at the heart of your national existence; and followers of Islam comparatively less in numbers, but animated by the zeal and vigour and austerity which have always characterised the religious history of your race. (Applause.) We are met here in this great representative assembly to lay before the public and the Government a practical programme of policy which covers, I believe, most of the important political and economic problems of the Indian Empire. We do not pretend to prepare any such policy within these walls. The work of educating public opinion is carried on throughout the year, and year by year, by means of the Press and the proceedings of local political bodies and associations. The work is fostered by the pronouncements and speeches of representative Indians who are afforded the opportunity, rare and seldom though it be, of uttering their country's voice in the Council Chambers of the State. In these ways public opinion is formed, a national policy is framed, and in due course it is crystallised into a definite shape. It is our function at the annual meetings of the Indian National Congress to give

united and authoritative expression to views on which there is already a consensus of opinion in the country. (*Applause.*) We are met to-day for such a purpose, and for this duty no organisation is more qualified and none could better be fitted than our own.

LEADERS AND FOLLOWERS

The Indian National Congress has thus its own functions, which I take it upon myself to say, as a watchful eye-witness from its birth, it has discharged with exemplary fidelity, judgment, and moderation. Yours is a distinguished past. If you have not in any considerable measure succeeded in moulding the policy of Government, you have exercised an immense influence in developing the history of your country and the character of your countrymen. You have become a power in the land, and your voice peals like a trumpet-note from one end of India to the other. Your illustrious leaders have earned a niche in the Temple of Fame, and their memory will be cherished by a grateful posterity. Foremost among them I place the venerable figure of your Grand Old ex-President, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji (*loud and prolonged applause*) who, now in the evening of his life, at the age of four score years, applies himself with unremitting energy and patriotism to your cause. Among those who are lost to us, pre-eminent is Mahadev Govind Ranade (*loud applause*) the wise in counsel, whose death we do not cease to mourn. Nor will I omit the name of the late Manmohun Ghose, who has set before us a conspicuous example of practical and reconstructive effort. (*Cheers.*) We have still with us our distinguished Chairman of the Reception Committee, Sir Pherozeshah Mehta (*loud applause*), Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, the first of our Presidents, Mr. Justice Budrudin Tyabji, Mr. Justice Sankaran Nair, Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee, and Messrs. Dinsbaw Edulji Wacha and Gopal Krishna Gokhale. (*Applause.*) Why need I mention more names? They are all household words, not only in this Congress camp, but in hall and hamlet, in the palace and in the cottage. Their leadership

in India is ably supplemented by the labours of the British Committee of the Congress in England, and it is impossible to speak in terms of too high praise of the self-sacrificing devotion of Mr. Hume, and of Sir William Wedderburn (*loud applause*), whom it is a pleasure and honour to welcome to-day in our midst. The name of Mr. Hume will always be associated with the origin and growth, the mingled triumphs and defeats of the Indian National Congress. Sir William Wedderburn's unrivalled familiarity with the details of Indian political work in the United Kingdom and his exceptional knowledge of the Bombay Presidency are of the utmost utility to us at the present time. (*Applause.*) The late Mr. William Digby was not a member of the British Committee, but he was an Englishman devoted in an extraordinary degree to Indian interests; his whole life, indeed, was given up to the cause of India, and I desire from this place to commemorate his services and to acknowledge the profound loss India has sustained by his death. (*Loud applause.*)

Patience and perseverance, persistence in good repute and evil repute, earnestness and resolution, these are the attributes of the leaders of a national movement. I make bold to say that they are the qualities which your leaders possess. You may well be proud of them. (*Cheers.*) But the victory cannot be won by leaders only. It is for their followers to give them their loyal and undivided support. You cannot all be leaders. Captains and Generals are few in number; the plan of the campaign is designed by them, but success is assured by the obedience and discipline of the rank and file. I speak in no unfriendly spirit when I warn you of the risks you run by petty internal bickerings and dissension, by unworthy jealousies and ignoble depreciation of the life-long labours of the foremost men of your generation. It is here I lay my finger on the weakness of your organisation. These signs of frailty are natural, inevitable in the nascent growth of your movement. But they are none the less corroding and dangerous symptoms, the existence of which is undoubted, and which it is, at all costs, the duty of all of you who have the glow of patriotism in your hearts firmly to suppress and eradicate. .

ENGLAND AND INDIA

It is true that the reforms we advocate depend for the most part on their adoption by public opinion in England. Recall the case of Ireland! Internal agitation in Ireland was the necessary stepping-stone of reform, but by itself it accomplished little; it was only when Irish agitation forced itself upon English Liberal statesmen and was supplemented by a powerful phalanx of opinion in England, that any concessions were allowed to the sister island. And so it is in the case of India. The opportunity of a peaceful solution rests in both cases with the English people, who alone have it in their hands to effect a material modification in the attitude of Government through the pressure of public opinion from the Mother Country. In this lies the value of your British Committee in London. Perhaps you do not always recognise the services which have been rendered to your cause by the untiring exertions of the members of that Committee, who unceasingly place the Indian view of Indian affairs before the British public by means of Parliament, the Press, and the Platform. (*Loud Cheers.*) The work of this Committee deserves from you more generous support than it has received. It is from this point of view, also, that lies the importance of increasing the representation in Parliament of those who are not only possessed of an adequate knowledge of Indian affairs, but are also imbued with a hearty sympathy for the grievances and aspirations of the Indian people. You owe a deep debt of gratitude to those honourable members who are always willing to press Indian questions upon the House, of whom I would especially mention Messrs. Schwann and Roberts. (*Cheers.*) Mr. Caine, alas! is lost to us; but I need not tell you that the number of men in the present House of Commons who combine this knowledge and sympathy may be counted on the fingers of one hand. Remember that it is in the House of Commons that the great questions on which the fate of India depends must be ultimately decided. (*Hear, hear.*)

MEMBERS FOR INDIA

We want more Members for India. Yes, indeed! But remember also that the use of that phrase cannot but ring

a delusive note. Do not deceive yourselves or expect too much. We want to hear more of India in the House of Commons. We want members of the House who will devote themselves to India as an integral and not the least important part of the British dominions, as a portion of the Empire which is not directly represented, and calls, therefore, for their special attention; but we cannot expect from them that undivided devotion to Indian interests to which we are so accustomed in this country from our own leaders. Sir Henry Fowler once declared that all the members of the House of Commons were members for India, but this is the very apotheosis of cant (*shame*) and we have only to be present in the gallery of the House when Indian questions are under discussion to realise that no statement could be further from the truth. India returns no representatives to Parliament; and even the most friendly members for Parliamentary constituencies are not returned to represent India in the House, but their own constituents. They never can be members for India in the strict sense of the expression, for the first claim upon a member of the House of Commons is, and always must be, held upon him by his constituents.

THE FUNCTIONS OF PARLIAMENT

Remember, also, what are the relations between the Imperial Parliament and the Indian Government.

"It is not our business," said Mr. Gladstone on a memorable occasion, "to advise what machinery the Indian Government should use. It is our business to give to those representing Her Majesty's Government in India ample information as to what we believe to be sound principles of government. It is also the duty and the function of this House to comment upon any case in which we think the authorities in India have failed to give due effect to those principles, but in the discharge of their high administrative functions, or as to the choice of means, there is no doubt that that should be left in their hands."

These words convey a wise warning that the duty of England towards India is to form convictions on the general policy which should guide the Government and to stimulate and strengthen and control the authorities in putting them into practice. (*Hear, hear.*) They do not

imply any abnegation of the responsibilities of Parliament for the good government of India, and there is little echo of them of the pitiful appeal of the Indian bureaucracy to preserve India from Parliamentary interference. But they are a timely reminder to us that the function of Parliament is not to make any attempt to extend its direct rule to India, and that the details of administration must be left to the local authorities, upon whom must rest the personal responsibility of giving effect to the general principles which are laid down for their guidance.

THE OPPORTUNITIES OF A GENERAL ELECTION

All these are qualifications which it is necessary for us to bear in mind, but the great enduring fact remains that the Parliament of Great Britain and the people of England are the final arbiters of India's destinies. (*Applause.*) It is not in India itself that the fate of India will ultimately be determined. Those are blind, and worse than blind, who ignore or depreciate the importance of the work that devolves on your English associates and on the delegates whom you may send from India to educate and build up the growth of English public opinion in regard to India. The present is one of those critical periods that recur every few years. No one can say precisely when a general election will take place. But every one knows that it cannot be much longer delayed, and in all human probability the interval between the twentieth and twenty-first Congress will witness the great upheaval to which we are looking forward in party politics at home, the expulsion of the present Government from office and the formation of another in its place, the appointment of a Liberal Secretary of State for India, and the beginning of a period during which it is reasonable to expect, not only the undoing of many of the mistakes committed during ten dark years of reaction, but also some definite advance in the work of reconstruction. (*Loud applause.*) We stand at the parting of the ways. We see before us a period of hope of which for so long we have been unable to catch a gleam. But in order that this period may be rendered fruitful much will need to be done, and assuredly

one of the first and most important things is that the Indian National Congress should clearly and emphatically put forward its proposals, organise and inspire its forces, and make all necessary preparations for an epoch-making campaign.

THE GROWTH OF A NATIONAL SPIRIT

What is the great political problem that lies before you? What is the real meaning of the movement which has brought you together to-day and animates your thoughts and action? It is the consciousness that your organisation is a national one, and that you are working together in the formation of a national movement with common sentiments of interest and patriotism. The different races, the numberless castes, classes, and creeds of India are welded together in your ranks. This is primarily the result of education, the inestimable boon which, in accordance with a noble and liberal policy, England has extended to India. It is education, and education on English methods and on the lines of Western civilisation, that has served to unite the varying forces among the Indian populations. The English language is the channel through which you are now able to meet on a common platform, and to give expression to your common interests and aspirations. At the same time the railways, the steamships, the post office, and the telegraph have played their part in closing the gap that used to keep the different provinces of India asunder. I rejoice to see that this great movement is fully recognised by your countrymen. It advances by leaps and bounds. The unmistakable yearning for nationality finds its utterance through a Newspaper Press which has now become a potent factor in your politics. (*Loud applause.*) I have watched the growth of this Press, rising, in little more than one generation, from struggling, obscure, and fitful efforts, into an organ of great power, criticising the measures of Government with remarkable independence and vigour, and continually checking the abuses of executive authority. I am not blind to its imperfections, but it is impossible not to admire the ability and patriotism with which

it is conducted. The unanimity of this Press is as marked as the increase of its influence. (*Applause.*) The whole of its influence is in the direction of nationalisation. A single note is struck. In every large town in India newspapers are now published, identical in their spirit and in their common object, all aiming and converging at the formation of a single political ideal. (*Applause.*)

The growth of a national spirit is the touchstone of your organisation. This assemblage of delegates to an Indian National Congress is the decisive evidence of a national movement. The growth of an Indian nation is the great political revolution that is working before our eyes. There is no doubt of its meaning, its character, or its destination. It involves the introduction of no anarchical element into India's future; there is no sign of any rupture with the past. We know, indeed, that the present form of British administration cannot be permanent. The Hon. Mountstuart Elphinstone (*applause*), whose memory is still revered in this Presidency, where he ruled as Governor for eight years, wrote as long ago as 1850 :—

I conceive that the administration of all the departments of a great country by a small number of foreign visitors, in a state of isolation produced by a difference in religion, ideas, and manners which cuts them off from all intimate communion with the people, can never be contemplated as a permanent state of things. I conceive, also, that the progress of education among the Natives renders such a scheme impracticable, even if it were otherwise free from objection. (*Applause.*)

Every thinking man must know that these words are true. But we know also that the connection between India and England will not be snapped. The English language, while it is the means of enabling you to attain unity, binds you also to Great Britain. The future of India is linked with that of England, and it is to England that India must always look for guidance, assistance, and protection in her need.

A COMPLEX PROBLEM

We have to deal with a problem of extraordinary difficulty and complexity. We are face to face with a

great upheaval which has revolutionised all departments of thought, inspired the aspirations of diverse communities and infused the sense of nationality throughout a vast and surging empire. I have just quoted the words of a sagacious and eminent Anglo-Indian, uttered more than fifty years ago. I will supplement them by a quotation from one who is universally recognised as the greatest and most successful of Britain's Pro-Consuls. More than twenty years have now elapsed since Lord Cromer (*cheers*) said :

No one who watches the signs of the times in India with even moderate care can doubt that we have entered upon a period of change. The spread of education, the increasing influence of a free Press, the substitution of legal for discretionary administration, the progress of railways and telegraphs, the easier communication with Europe, and the more ready influx of European ideas are beginning to produce a marked effect upon the people. New ideas are springing up. New aspirations are being called forth. The power of public opinion is growing daily. Such a condition of affairs is one in which the task of Government, and especially of a despotic Government, is beset with difficulties of no light kind. To move too fast is dangerous, but to lag behind is more dangerous still. The problem is how to deal with this new-born spirit of progress, raw and superficial as in many respects it is, so as to direct it into the right course, and to derive from it all the benefits which its development is capable of ultimately conferring upon the country, and at the same time to prevent it from becoming, through blind indifference or stupid repression, a source of serious political danger. It is only what ought to be expected by every thoughtful man, that, after fifty years of free Press and thirty years of expanding education, with European ideas flowing into the country on every side, and old indigenous customs, habits and prejudices breaking down, changes should be taking place in the thoughts, the desires, and the aims of the intelligent and educated men of the country which no wise and cautious Government can afford to disregard, and to which they must gradually adapt their system of administration if they do not wish to see it shattered by forces which they have themselves called into being but which they have failed to guide and control. (*Loud applause.*)

THE FUTILITY OF REACTION

This quotation is a long one, but it is fraught with wisdom, and it is needless to say that, during the twenty years which have since elapsed, the conditions mentioned by Lord Cromer have developed with increasing rapidity.

It is not within the power of any man to obstruct the tide of progress, otherwise than for a time, by a policy of reaction. (*Hear, hear.*) The period of Lord Ripon (*loud cheers*), and of his Finance Minister (*continued cheers*) who is now Lord Cromer, has been well described as the Golden Age of Indian Reformers, when the aspirations of the people were encouraged, education and local self-government were fostered, and the foundations of Indian nationality were firmly laid. (*Applause.*) The natural trend of official opinion has been to assert itself in a reactionary outburst against this development, disparaging the vantage-ground acquired in the past. (*Shame*) We are told that the salvation of India is not to be sought on the field of politics at the present stage of her development, that there are many other fields of usefulness and power which lie around the citadel of politics, and that when these fields are occupied, the entrance to real political life will be easy, natural, and safe. We read in the columns of the *Times*:—

We must wearily retrace our steps and devote our energies to educating the Indians in character and common sense. Then, and not till then, can we put them out into the polytechnic of local self-government.

We must wait, forsooth, for a working reality "until generations of really educated Indians have come and gone". (*Ironical laughter.*) We are told that the weakness and limitations of the newly-educated classes are now more clearly perceived, and that the complexities of the problems of Oriental politics are more distinctly realised. These are the commonplaces of reaction. They are the arguments of Mr. Noodle in his fatuous oration by Sydney Smith. (*Loud laughter.*) But it is not by indulgence in such vague generalities that the current of advance can be stemmed. (*A voice—"No, never."*) Of what avail is it to disparage Burke and Maculay and Bright, Ripon, Cromer, and Elphinstone? You cannot withstand the flowing tide. Temporary spasms of reaction are inevitable. They pass away like footprints on the sand, and we need not trouble ourselves too much with vexatious aberrations from the path of progress. They will be quickly forgotten. I have seen signs among you of depression, and have noticed

a tendency to submit with resignation to the policy of a *regime* which affords no encouragement to your aspirations. I am not surprised at these symptoms, but assuredly you have little cause for giving way to a sense of despondency. It is not reserved to any human agency to set back the dial of time. The result of reaction is always to galvanise into fresh life. Be vigilant, therefore ; be hopeful ; be of 'good' cheer and of a gladsome countenance. Relax not your efforts, for the waves of progress are irresistibly dashing against the breakwater of prejudice, and even now the day is dawning which Macaulay declared would be the proudest day of England's history. (*Loud applause.*)

THE IDEAL OF INDIA'S FUTURE

Let us accustom ourselves to the conception which the realisation of a national spirit in India involves. The present form of British administration cannot survive the fulfilment of those national tendencies which the British Government itself has brought into existence. But India is bound to England as England is to India. England has incurred liabilities not lightly to be set aside, and she should no more break from her past than should India break from the traditions of her history. It was lately declared by a high authority that he could not conceive of a time as remotely possible in which it would be either practicable or desirable that Great Britain should take her hand from the Indian plough. But such is not my conception of India's future. An abrupt retreat would, indeed, be advocated by no one, and the process of reconstruction cannot be effected otherwise than by slow and gradual means. Many years must elapse before we can expect the consummation of a reconstructive policy. But it is a policy which we should always keep before our eyes. Indian patriots look back on their past with a just sense of pride, and they know that India will again take her own rank among the nations of the East. They are striving for the attainment of this ideal which, however it may be delayed or marred in execution, is sure in the event. (*Loud applause.*) .

Autonomy is the key-note of England's true relations with her great Colonies. It is the key-note also of India's destiny. It is more than this: it is the destiny of the world. (*Hear, hear.*) The tendency of Empire in the civilised world is in the direction of compact autonomous States which are federated together and attached by common motives and self-interest to a central power. You have already local legislatures, in which a certain measure of representation has been granted to the Indian people. A small concession has been made in this direction, but it is wholly inadequate to meet growing demands. In the cautious and gradual development of representation, in the increase of your power and influence in India itself, involving the ultimate extension of autonomy, we shall find the appropriate and natural prize and legitimate goal for Indian aspirations. It was the dream of John Bright, and he indulged in no mere mystic prophecy when he foresaw that India would fulfil her ultimate destinies by a process of evolution, out of which she would emerge, not through force or violence as an independent State, or torn from the Mother Country, or abandoned to England's enemies, but as a federated portion of the dominion of the great British Empire. The ideal of an Indian patriot is the establishment of a federation of free and separate States, the United States of India, placed on a fraternal footing with the Self-Governing Colonies, each with its own local autonomy, cemented together under the ægis of Great Britain. That is a forecast of a future, dim and distant though it be, the gradual realisation of which it is the privilege of Government to regulate, and the aim and hope and aspiration of the Indian people to attain.

This is our ideal of India's future. The process of reconstruction should be always before our eyes. Changes may, and should, be gradual, but they must come, and we should prepare ourselves for their realisation. Statesmanship consists in foreseeing, and we are all of us the better for the exercise of forethought. Familiarise yourselves, therefore, with a conception of India's future, which gathers, as it grows, and insensibly attracts into the political

evolution all other great problems of economic and social reform which are awaiting solution. (*Applause.*)

THE ECONOMIC PROBLEM

What is your economic problem? It is the poverty of your people. No one who considers the economic condition of India can doubt that one of its greatest evils is to be found in the fact that the great mass of the people are dependent upon the cultivation of the soil. The establishment of large industries capitalised by Englishmen affords but a poor compensation for the variety of indigenous industries once spread through the country. An India supplying England with its raw products and dependent upon the West for all its more important manufactures, is not a condition of affairs which an Indian patriot can contemplate with equanimity. I may be allowed to appropriate the words which have been uttered by your distinguished Viceroy in another connection :

There is no spectacle which finds less favour in my eyes than that of a cluster of Europeans settling down upon a foreign country and sucking from it the moisture which ought to give sustenance to its own people.

India is the field where British capital is invested, but all the interest that is reaped therefrom passes to the pocket of the investor, and he takes it to England. This is a part of the economic drain which has been sneered at as a "copy-book fallacy" and as "a foolish and dangerous illusion". But how can it be denied that it would be vastly more beneficial to India if the wealth produced in the country were spent in the country? India is poor and there are those who believe that in consequence of its political conditions it is becoming poorer; but the ambition of your people is to take their place among other nations in the future federation of the world. Your opposition to the exploitation of your country by foreigners is based upon a conviction that this exploitation is a real obstacle to your progress, and you do not need to be assured by me that the prosperity of your country depends on the diminution of its economic drain and on the conservation of its resources for ultimate development by indigenous agency. (*Hear, hear.*) I am glad

to recognise the growing tendency of Indians to help themselves. The death of Mr. Tata (*applause*) was an irreparable loss, but there are others, stimulated by his example, who will strive to take his place. The Industrial Exhibitions in connection with the annual meetings of our Congress are a satisfactory evidence of the tendency of which I speak. The difficulties are immense, for the essential difficulty always hinges on the disagreeable truth that there can be no revival of Indian industry without some displacement of British industry. (*Hear, hear.*) But the first steps have been taken, and a start made by Indian capitalists. The beginnings are small, very small at present, but like the little cloud no bigger than a man's hand they may grow and swell with a full promise of abundance. It rests with you to see that the present impetus does not flag or dissipate itself in idle words.

THE PROBLEM OF WESTERN INFLUENCES ON THE EAST

Look at Japan! The force which has made Japan what she is, is an absorbing patriotism derived from, and dependent on, her national existence. It is based on collective action which independence alone can give. What an inspiration is afforded by the character of these Eastern islanders! What an example have they not set to the East of the power of a patriotic spirit! The conditions in India do not point to any early renaissance such as we have witnessed in Japan. But the changes that are taking place among you are as remarkable in their social, moral, and religious relations as in their political and economic aspects, and your nascent nationalism is the magnet which holds together the solvent influences of Western civilisation let loose on the simple society of the East. Under the immediate effect of these influences, your old organisations are crumbling up, and you have entered upon a long period of transition preparatory to the establishment of a new order. The result of English education has been to break the continuity of centuries, and the problem now is to bridge over the period of disorder with the least disturbance. Official interference was unavoidable in the first instance—in no other way could a beginning have been

made but the educational movement in India now stands in need of no such stimulus. It is in matters of education more than any other that the people of the country have become ripe for self-Government. (*Hear, hear.*) Systematic education is already falling into the hands of private enterprise. The time has come for the Government to transfer its educational endowments to the custody of those who have been educated through them. The present system of University education should be reconstituted on a representative basis. A policy which proposes to knit together still tighter the bonds of official control is absolutely retrograde. (*Hear, hear.*) It has been condemned by every section of Indian opinion; and though it may temporarily prevail, it will be as evanescent as it is unsound. It is only through the educated members of your own community that it will be possible to guide your countrymen at large, so as to ensure that the changes which are being wrought by contact with the West shall be effected without danger and in a healthy manner. It is reserved for you to link the present with the past and to introduce modifications with regard to the antecedents which always must powerfully affect the environment in which you are placed. The problem of grafting Western ideas on to an Oriental stock is now ready for solution in the only way in which a successful solution is possible by means of Orientals who, having been thoroughly imbued with a knowledge of Western civilisation, have at the same time not lost sight of the traditions of their past.

THE KEY-NOTE OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM

I will not dwell on the constitutional modifications, the administrative changes, which were foreshadowed by Lord Cromer twenty years ago. You will dilate on many of these in the discussion of the resolutions which it will be my duty to submit for the approval of this Congress. These resolutions will be transmitted by me for the consideration of the Government of India. We cannot tell what consideration they may there receive. A bureaucratic Government is not likely to under-estimate the value of any administrative reform which it puts forward

of its own initiative or the urgency of the call for its introduction. But when the proposed reforms are pressed on them from outside and affect their own constitution, we need have no apprehension of undue haste or injudicious eagerness to accept them. Of this at least we are conscious, that our proposals are worthy of consideration, for they bear the hall-mark of Indian public opinion and will be endorsed by the organs of your educated countrymen throughout the length and breadth of India. The key-note of administrative reform is the gradual substitution of Indian for European official agency. (*Hear, hear.*) This is the one end towards which you are concentrating your efforts, and the concession of this demand is the only means of satisfying the most reasonable of your legitimate aspirations. Lord Ripon justly urged on behalf of his scheme of local self-government that it would be an instrument of political education. (*Loud applause.*) And it may be as truly said that if we desire to eventually establish an independent Government, we can only do so by training the people to a sense of self-help and self-reliance through familiarity with the details, as well as the principles of executive administration. We pray that our rulers may be endowed with this desire. It is no unworthy aim that we hold out to them for fulfilment. It is a title to glory all their own that they found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of subjection, and have so ruled them as to make them desirous of all the privileges of citizenship. (*Cheers.*) But however great may be their energy and activity in working through an official agency, it counts as dross if they lack the higher genius of educating the people by making them work for themselves, of evoking their powers by affording them opportunities for their exercise, and of raising them from a condition of mere passive subjection to a capacity for the discharge of higher responsibility. A nation is the best administered which can manage its own concerns with the least aid from Government; and no system of administration can be progressive or beneficial which crushes out the self-reliance of the people and blights their legitimate aspirations to realise their destiny through their own exertions. (*Hear, hear.*)

• RECONSTITUTION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE AND THE
SEPARATION OF EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS

To meet this end the complete reconstitution of the Indian Civil Service is necessary. It is surprising how little change there has been in the form of administration in India during the past century. The character of the Civil Service has been theoretically unchanged. It is a fine old service, of which I, of all men, have reason to speak with respect. It has enrolled within its ranks men, of whom the Mother Country may well be proud. It is, however, a form of administration both bureaucratic and autocratic, and an organisation suited only to a government by foreigners. It has been perceptibly weakening from its inherent inapplicability to an environment where changes are becoming rapid. It must pass away, after a prolonged period of magnificent work, to be replaced by a more popular system which shall perpetuate its efficiency while avoiding its defects. The Government should now find expression in a form of administration more representative and less concentrated in individuals. The principles of administration for which we are indebted to Lord Ripon have paved the way for this reform, and centralisation is already giving way to local self-government. (*Applause.*) In the natural course of things, administrative officers must be chosen more and more from the permanent residents of the locality. The injurious custom of constant transfers and changes will then cease. The interests of efficiency and economy will alike be served by the appointment of Indians on the spot to perform functions for which we now import foreigners from Europe and Indians brought from every other part of the province than that in which they are employed. (*Hear, hear.*) In the judicial branch of the service, reorganisation is immediately required. The members of the Civil Service, when very young and very ignorant of the language, are vested with magisterial powers beyond comparison greater than those possessed by corresponding functionaries under any civilised Government, and it would be strange indeed if they were not led into occasional errors and sometimes into abuse of power. It is

the system that is to blame. There is no longer any reason why, over the greater part of India, important judicial functions should be discharged by persons of immature years, and it is a crying reform in regard to the administration of justice (in all but backward tracts where the patriarchal system must still prevail) that only those persons should be vested with judicial powers whose age, training, and experience afford a guarantee for the proper exercise of authority. Patience and discrimination, respect for the forms of law, rigid imperviousness to rumour and to outside report—these are some of the qualifications which are the essential attributes of the judicial office. There is no stage in the career of a civilian which affords him the opportunity for their acquisition. The whole training of an Indian civilian unfits him for judicial work. The remedy lies in the complete separation of the judicial from the executive service, and judicial appointments should be reserved, as they are in other countries, for members of the legal profession who are trained to undertake the duties attaching to them. In no other way would the separation be really complete, and by no other process of selection it is possible to secure the proper discharge of judicial functions. (*Applause.*)

ENLARGEMENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

The greatest of the administrative reforms which have been effected in India since Lord Ripon's time is the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils on a partially representative basis. (*Loud applause.*) I congratulate the Indian National Congress on the no inconsiderable share of which it may boast in the accomplishment of this reform. The Indian Councils Act, which was passed in 1892, has operated to the general satisfaction of the public and to the advantage of Government. But it was not a perfect measure, and it labours under defects which no amount of tactfulness or happy give-and-take on the part of Provincial Governors or elected members can obviate. It is impossible to give adequate representation to a Province containing many millions of inhabitants in a Council of only twenty members. It is necessary,

therefore, to enlarge the Councils. It is expedient also to secure their stability and dignity by including in their constitution those noblemen whose position and status in the country entitle them to be recognised as legislators. We ought never to lose sight of the fact that India, in spite of all its changes, is and always has been an aristocratic and conservative country, and that any attempt to democratise Indian institutions is calculated to result in failure. The adoption of a scheme for enlarged Councils on a really representative basis would not only afford satisfaction to the educated classes of the community, but it would gratify and conciliate the nobility and ensure for them a share in the responsibilities of administration commensurate to their rank.

FINANCIAL CONTROL IN TIBET

It is necessary also to increase the power of these Councils, especially in regard to matters of finance. At present a budget is submitted to them for their information, and they are entitled to criticise it, but they have no power to control or vote against its provisions. Vast sums of money are annually spent on enterprises which exclusively affect your interests, but your representatives possess no check whatever over the outlay, and as there is none in Parliament, so it is the more necessary that it should be exercised in India itself. I will take a concrete case: the cost of the Tibetan expedition. When Mr. Brodrick was lately challenged in the House of Commons on this question, he exclaimed that those should pay the piper who called the tune. Was there ever a grosser travesty or more mischievous misuse of this familiar proverb? (*Shame, shame.*) I think we know who called the tune. It was certainly not the people of India. Is there a single man in this vast representative assembly who would hold himself in the smallest degree responsible for undertaking or recommending that expedition? There is not one. (*A Voice "No."*) The people of India are, and were, unanimously opposed to it. I speak for you all. There is not one of you who does not unreservedly condemn this act of wanton violence and aggression, and who does not deplore

the ruthless slaughter of imperfectly armed monks and simple shepherds, "whose bones lie scattered on the mountains cold," and whose only offence consisted in their resisting invasion and disarmament in their own country. (*Hear, hear.*) And yet, in spite of universal protest, the whole of this expedition, which was undertaken to increase Britain's trade and establish what is described as Imperial prestige in Central Asia, is imposed upon the overburdened and poverty-stricken people of India. (*Shame.*) I can recall many instances of financial injustice which have been perpetrated in the interests of England in her dealings with this country, but none more indefensible and impossible to justify in a properly constituted Council.

[THE PROPOSED PARTITION OF BENGAL

A word, too, I wish to say on a subject which is so justly agitating the minds of my old friends in Bengal; I allude to the proposed partition of that province. We shall recognise that this is a matter of more than local interest when we recall that the sinister aspect of the proposal is to shatter, if it be possible to do so, the unity, and to undermine the feelings of solidarity which are so happily established among the members of a compact and national branch of the Empire. (*Hear, hear.*) The idea of the severance of the oldest and the most populous and wealthy portion of the province, and the division of its people into two arbitrary sections, has given a profound shock to the Bengali race. I do not think I ever remember popular sentiment to have been more deeply stirred than it has been by this scheme for the separation of one-half of Bengal from the capital of the province and its amalgamation with Assam. It has been suggested that there should be a new Lieutenant-Governorship with all its expensive paraphernalia of a large secretariat and separate departments; a scheme which is not without its attraction to the members of an autocratic bureaucracy, who see before them the prospect of additional offices and emoluments. But it is repugnant to the last degree to the inhabitants of the country affected, who are aghast at the

idea of their exclusion from a province to which they are attached by all historic material, social and sentimental associations. I admit that it is desirable to relieve the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal from some of the responsibilities which rest upon his shoulders. But this end may easily be attained by other means ; either by the appointment of an Executive Council, or, preferably I think, by the separation of Behar, which is not peopled by Bengalis, and the constitution of that province, with a population of twenty millions in round numbers, as a separate administration with its own Chief Commissioner. It would be easy to devise a scheme which would not receive the unanimous disapproval of the affected population. To press on proposals such as those which have been put forward for the break-up of Bengal against the loudly expressed wishes and sentiments of the Bengali people can only be described as a most arbitrary and unsympathetic evidence of irresponsible and autocratic statesmanship. (*Hear, hear.*) I am convinced that a Liberal Secretary of State would never sanction such proposals, and I fervently trust that the Government of India, in the exercise of their own good sense and better feeling, will not shrink from abandoning a project so universally condemned.

INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL

I will add another protest on the question of Indians in South Africa. We do not forget that Lord Landsdowne, a few weeks after the outbreak of the Boer War, in his dual capacity of Secretary of State for War and ex-Viceroy of India, assured a Sheffield audience that of all the misdeeds of the Boers none filled him with so much anger as their treatment of British Indians ; and that he went so far as to paint a lurid picture of the political evils which might have been expected to follow in India itself if England had failed to put an end to such insolent injustice. It was on these grounds that the war was justified to the British public. In this way hope was afforded that at the close of the war the anti-Indian policy of the Boers would be reversed. But has it been reversed ? Far from it. Peace having been secured, the British rulers of the

Transvaal have applied themselves with British vigour and precision to the task of enforcing Boer law. In dealing with Indian colonists their little finger has been thicker than Mr. Kruger's loins, and where he had chastised with whips, they have chastised with scorpions. Fortunately, your fellow-countrymen were not dismayed: they lost no opportunity of asserting their rights, and their efforts have at last been awarded by a decision of the Supreme Court, which has vindicated their claim to trade in any part of the Transvaal. The response to this has been an official agitation to set aside this decision by legislation, and in a despatch to His Majesty's Government, Lord Milner actually writes:

I think that to attempt to place coloured people on an equality with whites in South Africa is wholly impracticable, and that, moreover, it is in principle wrong.

What a hopeless attitude is indicated in these words! Before the war Indians were free to enter the country without restriction or payment of registration fee, residence in any part of the Republic was permitted, and freedom to travel was allowed. Under British rule no immigration is permitted other than under severe restrictions (*shame*) and the payment of an annual registration fee of £3; all Indians, excepting those who pass an educational test in a language other than their own, are compelled to reside in locations, and a vexatious system of photographic passes has been established without warrant in law; inoperative Boer enactments have been brought into force and rendered more stringent by Ordinances or executive orders, and British Indians have been offensively classed in legislation with Hottentots. (*Loud cries of "Shame, shame."*) These are the grievances of which we complain, and I rejoice to think that a resolution protesting against them will be framed by this Congress, which I venture to hope, will strengthen the hands of the Government of India in withstanding the further perpetration of avoidable wrong.

CONCLUSION

I am now bringing my remarks to a conclusion. We have good grounds for hope. The foundations of the future have been laid, and a superstructure is arising upon them. Skill, care, and forethought are needed : enthusiasm tempered by prudence in the construction of the edifice, liberality and largeness of conception in the design. 'You' are the nucleus of a movement the power of which grows every day, and already supplies the most potent impulse in inspiring, instructing, and controlling the varied forces upon which the future of India depends. It has been the labour of my life to endeavour to ameliorate the relations between rulers and the ruled, to soften asperities and to evoke confidence and respect through sympathy. (*Cheers.*) My position among you to-day is an evidence that I have not altogether failed. I have carried on the golden lamp to those who shall come after me. I have never despaired of the present or doubted of the success which is destined eventually to crown your efforts. But it is upon yourselves that you must rely for the initiation and development of schemes which depend in their systematic application and fulfilment, upon the local source from which they emanate. You are not without the noblest stimulus to co-operate with heart and soul in the great work that lies before you. The memory of the dead is with us at this hour. May the memories of Ram Mohun Roy and Dayanand, the energising labours of Kristo Das Pal, of Telang and Ranade, whose names we have inscribed with reverential love on the roll of Indian patriots, infuse into your hearts the zeal and strength to devote your own lives to the service of your country. Strive to show yourselves constantly worthy of your cause. (*Loud applause.*) You have incurred grave responsibilities, do not shrink from the honest endeavour to discharge them worthily.

We live in deeds, not years ; in thoughts, not breaths ;
In feelings, not in figures on a dial ;
We should count life by heart-throbs. He most lives
Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best.

Labour each in your own sphere, as you are bound to do, to hand on to your successors the large endowments you have received, augmented and improved by your own exertions. Be tolerant towards all. And especially take to heart the need of brotherly feeling towards one another and of a spirit of veneration and gratitude to your leaders in this national movement. Remember that moral improvement is the only source of real unity, and as such of dignity as well as happiness. (*Vociferous and prolonged cheers.*)

Twenty-first Congress—Benares—1905

THE HON. MR. G. K. GOKHALE, C.I.E.

INTRODUCTION

FELLOW-DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the great, the signal honour, which you have conferred upon me by electing me to preside over your deliberations this year. As has been said by more than one of my predecessors, the Presidentship of the Congress is the highest distinction, which it is in the power of our countrymen to bestow upon any one ; and proud indeed is that moment in an Indian's life, when he receives at your hands this most conspicuous mark of your confidence and your favour. As I, however, stand before you to-day, it is not so much the honour of the position, great as that is, as the responsibility which it imposes upon me that occupies my thoughts. When I was first invited nearly four months ago to accept this office, we were able to see on the horizon only the small cloud no bigger than a man's hand. Since then the sky has been overcast and for some time a storm has been raging ; and it is with rocks ahead and angry waves beating around that I am called upon to take charge of the vessel of the Congress. Even the stoutest heart among us may well own to a feeling of anxiety in such a situation. Let us, however, humbly trust that in this holy city of Benares, the Divine guidance, on which we may securely throw ourselves, will not fail us, and that the united wisdom and patriotism of the delegates assembled will enable the Congress to emerge from the present crisis with unimpaired and even enhanced prestige and usefulness.

THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES

Gentlemen, our first duty to-day is to offer our most loyal and dutiful welcome to Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales on the occasion of this their first to visit India. The Throne in England is above all parties—beyond all controversies. It is the permanent seat of the majesty, the honour and the beneficence of the British Empire. And in offering our homage to its illustrious occupants and their heirs and representatives, we not only perform a loyal duty, but also express the gratitude of our hearts for all that is noble and high-minded in England's connection with India. The late Queen-Empress, again, was known, within the limits of her constitutional position, to exercise during her reign her vast influence in favour of a policy of justice and sympathy towards the Indian people. We can never forget that the great Proclamation of 1858, on which we take our stand so largely in our constitutional struggle, was not only in spirit but also in substance her own declaration of the principles, on which India was to be governed. The present King-Emperor has announced his resolve to walk in the footsteps of his mother, and we have no doubt that the Prince of Wales is animated by the same desire to see a policy of righteousness pursued towards India. We rejoice that His Royal Highness and his noble consort have come out amongst us to acquaint themselves personally with the ancient civilization of this country and its present condition. The Congress earnestly and respectfully wishes Their Royal Highnesses a most successful tour through India, and it humbly trusts that the knowledge they will acquire and the recollections they will carry back with them will constitute a fresh bond of sympathy and attachment between the Royal family in England and the Princes and Peoples of this country.

THE NEW VICEROY

The Congress also offers a most cordial and respectful welcome to Their Excellencies Lord and Lady Minto. The new Viceroy assumes the responsibilities of his office at a critical juncture. The temper of the people, so sorely tried

during the last three years, calls for the exercise of wise and statesmanlike conciliation on the part of those who are in authority, if further estrangement between the rulers and the ruled is to be prevented. I earnestly trust that such conciliation will be forthcoming. Meanwhile special responsibility rests upon all to see to it that the immediate task that confronts His Excellency is not made more difficult than it already is. The difficulties of the situation are not of Lord Minto's creating, and he has a right to expect the co-operation of both the officials and the public in his endeavours to terminate a state of tension, which has already produced deplorable results and which cannot be prolonged without serious detriment to the best interests of the country.

LORD CURZON'S ADMINISTRATION

Gentlemen, how true it is that to everything there is an end! Thus even the Viceroyalty of Lord Curzon has come to a close! For seven long years, all eyes had constantly to turn to one masterful figure in the land,—now in admiration, now in astonishment, more often in anger and in pain, till at last it has become difficult to realize that a change has really come. For a parallel to such an administration, we must, I think, go back to the times of Aurangzeb in the history of our own country. There we find the same attempt at a rule excessively centralized and intensely personal, the same strenuous purpose, the same overpowering consciousness of duty, the same marvellous capacity for work, the same sense of loneliness, the same persistence in a policy of distrust and repression, resulting in bitter exasperation all round. I think even the most devoted admirer of Lord Curzon cannot claim that he has strengthened the foundations of British rule in India. In some respects, His Lordship will always be recognized as one of the greatest Englishmen, that ever came out to this country. His wonderful intellectual gifts, his brilliant powers of expression, his phenomenal energy, his boundless enthusiasm for work,—these will ever be a theme of just and unstinted praise. But the gods are jealous, and amidst such lavish endowments, they

withheld from him a sympathetic imagination, without which no man can ever understand an alien people; and it is a sad truth that to the end of his administration Lord Curzon did not really understand the people of India. This was at the root of his many inconsistencies and made him a perpetual puzzle to most men. And thus the man, who professed in all sincerity, before he assumed the reins of office, his great anxiety to show the utmost deference to the feelings and even the prejudices of those over whom he was set to rule, ended by denouncing in unmeasured terms not only the present generation of Indians but also their remote ancestors and even the ideals of their race, which they cherish above everything else; he, who, in the early part of his administration, publicly warned the official classes that "official wisdom is not so transcendent as to be superior to the stimulus and guidance" of public opinion and who declared that in the present state of India "the opinion of the educated classes is one which it is not statesmanship to ignore or to despise", ended by trampling more systematically upon that opinion than any of his predecessors, and claiming for his own judgment and that of his official colleagues a virtual character of infallibility. The fact is that Lord Curzon came to India with certain fixed ideas. To him India was a country, where the Englishman was to monopolise for all time all power and talk all the while of duty. The Indian's only business was to be governed, and it was a sacrilege on his part to have any other aspiration. In his scheme of things there was no room for the educated classes of the country; and having failed to amuse them for any length of time by an empty show of taking them into his confidence, he proceeded in the end to repress them. Even in his last farewell speech at the Byculla Club in Bombay, India exists only as a scene of the Englishman's labours, with the toiling millions of the country—80 per cent. of the population—in the background. The remaining 20 per cent., for aught they are worth, might as well be gently swept into the sea! Had Lord Curzon been less self-centred, had he had more humility in his nature, he might perhaps have discovered his mistake before it was

too late. This would probably have enabled him to avoid giving so much offence and causing so much pain as he unhappily did during the last two years, but I doubt if the main current of his administration would even then have flowed in another channel. Lord Curzon's highest ideal of statesmanship is efficiency of administration. He does not believe in what Mr. Gladstone used to call the principle of liberty as a factor of human progress. He has no sympathy with popular aspirations, and when he finds them among a subject people, he thinks he is rendering their country a service by trying to put them down. Thus in his Byculla Club speech he actually stated that he had not offered political concessions to the people of India, because he "did not regard it as wisdom or statesmanship in the interests of India itself to do so"! Taking Lord Curzon at his highest, we find him engaged in a herculean attempt to strengthen the Englishman's monopoly of power in India and stem the tide of popular agitation and discontent by rousing the members of the bureaucracy to a sense of duty similar to his own and raising the standard of administrative efficiency all round. The attempt has failed as it was bound to fail. Never was discontent in India more acute and widespread than when the late Viceroy laid down the reins of office; and as regards the bureaucratic monopoly of power, I think we are sensibly nearer the time when it will be successfully assailed.

One claim Lord Curzon advanced in his farewell speech at Bombay, which it is necessary to examine a little. He told his hearers, as he had done once before—on the occasion of the last Budget—that even if he had incurred the hostility of educated Indians, the masses would be grateful to him for what he had done for them. This attempt to distinguish between the interests of the educated classes and those of the bulk of their countrymen is a favourite device with those who seek to repress the legitimate aspirations of our people. It is significant that Lord Curzon had never resorted to it till he had finally broken with the educated classes. We know of course that the distinction is unreal and ridiculous, and we know also that most of

those who use it as a convenient means to disparage the educated classes cannot themselves really believe in it. Lord Curzon mentions the reduction of the salt duty, the writing off of famine arrears, the increased grants to primary education and to irrigation, the attempt at Police Reform as measures on which he bases his claim. The suggestion here is that he adopted these measures for the good of the masses in spite of the opposition—at any rate, the indifference—of the educated classes when the plain fact is that it was the Congress that had been urging these measures year after year on the attention of Government and that it was only after years of persistent agitation that it was able to move the Government in the desired direction. Four years ago, when, with a surplus of seven crores or nearly five millions sterling in hand, the Government of India did not remit any taxation, and I ventured to complain of this in Council and to urge an immediate reduction of the salt duty, I well remember how Lord Curzon sneered at those who “talked glibly” of the burdens of the masses and of the necessity of lowering the salt tax as a measure of relief! Lord Curzon was fortunate in coming to India when the currency legislation of Lord Lansdowne and Sir David Barbour had succeeded in artificially raising the rupee to its present level, thereby enabling the Government of India to save about four millions sterling a year on its Home Remittances. This, with the recovery of the opium revenue, placed huge surpluses at Lord Curzon’s disposal throughout his administration, and he never knew a moment of that financial stress and anxiety, which his predecessors had to face for a series of years. Considering how large these surpluses have been, I do not think the relief given by Lord Curzon to the taxpayers of the country has by any means been liberal. He himself estimated last March the total amount of this relief at 7 millions sterling. He did not mention that during the same time he had taken from the taxpayers 33 millions sterling over and above the requirements of the Government. Again, how paltry is the relief given by the reduction of the salt duty and the writing off of famine arrears, compared with the enormous injury

done to the mass of our people by the artificial raising of the value of the rupee, which led to a heavy immediate depreciation of their small savings in silver and which makes a grievous addition to their permanent burdens by indirectly enhancing their assessments and increasing their debts to the money-lender, as prices adjust themselves to the new rupee! Much has been made of Lord Curzon's increased grants to primary education. Considering how little the State does in India for the education of the masses, it would have been astonishing, if with such surpluses Lord Curzon had not made any addition to the educational expenditure of the country. But if he has given a quarter of a million more to education, he has given five millions a year more to the Army; and with reckless profusion he has increased the salaries of European officials in many departments and has created several new posts for them. "A spirit of expenditure," to use an expression of Mr. Gladstone's, has been abroad in all directions during his time, and he has never practised the old-fashioned virtue of economy, with which the real interests of the people are bound up. Of course, a ruler cannot labour as devotedly as Lord Curzon has done for seven years for increased efficiency without removing or mitigating important administrative evils; but that is quite different from a claim to champion the special interests of the masses, as against their natural leaders and spokesmen, the educated classes of the community.

PARTITION OF BENGAL

Gentlemen, the question that is uppermost in the minds of us all at this moment is the Partition of Bengal. A cruel wrong has been inflicted on our Bengalee brethren, and the whole country has been stirred to its deepest depths in sorrow and resentment, as had never been the case before. The scheme of partition, concocted in the dark and carried out in the face of the fiercest opposition that any Government measure has encountered during the last half-a-century, will always stand as a complete illustration of the worst features of the present system of bureaucratic rule—its utter contempt for public opinion, its arrogant pretensions

to superior wisdom, its reckless disregard of the most cherished feelings of the people, the mockery of an appeal to its sense of justice, its cool preference of Service interests to those of the governed. Lord Curzon and his advisers—if he ever had any advisers—could never allege that they had no means of judging of the depth of public feeling in the matter. All that could possibly have been done by way of a respectful representation of the views of the people had been done. As soon as it was known that a partition of some sort was contemplated, meeting after meeting of protest was held, till over five hundred public meetings in all parts of the Province had proclaimed in no uncertain voice that the attempt to dismember a compact and homogeneous province, to which the people were passionately attached and of which they were justly proud, was deeply resented and would be resisted to the uttermost. Memorials to the same effect poured in upon the Viceroy. The Secretary of State for India was implored to withhold his sanction to the proposed measure. The intervention of the British House of Commons was sought first by a monster petition, signed by sixty thousand people, and later by means of a debate on the subject raised in the House by our ever-watchful friend, Mr. Herbert Roberts. All proved unavailing. The Viceroy had made up his mind. The officials under him had expressed approval. What business had the people to have an opinion of their own and to stand in the way? To add insult to injury, Lord Curzon described the opposition to his measure as “manufactured”—an opposition in which all classes of Indians, high and low, uneducated and educated, Hindus and Mahomedans had joined, an opposition than which nothing more intense, nothing more wide-spread, nothing more spontaneous had been seen in this country in the whole course of our political agitation! Let it be remembered that when the late Viceroy cast this stigma on those who were ranged against his proposals, not a single public pronouncement in favour of those proposals had been made by any section of the community; and that foremost among opponents of the measure were men like Sir Jotindra Mohan Tagore and Sir Gurudas Banerji, Raja-

Péary Mohan Mukherji and Dr. Rash Behary Ghose, the Maharajas of Mymensingh and Kassimbazar,—men who keep themselves aloof from ordinary political agitation and never say a word calculated in any way to embarrass the authorities, and who came forward to oppose publicly the Partition project only from an overpowering sense of the necessity of their doing what they could to avert a dreaded calamity. If the opinions of even such men are to be brushed aside with contempt, if all Indians are to be treated as no better than dumb-driven cattle, if men, whom any other country would delight to honour, are to be thus made to realize the utter humiliation and helplessness of their position in their own land, then all I can say is “Good-bye to all hope of co-operating in any way with the bureaucracy in the interests of the people!” I can conceive of no graver indictment of British Rule than that such a state of things should be possible after a hundred years of that rule.

Gentlemen, I have carefully gone through all the papers which have been published by the Government on this subject of Partition. Three things have struck me forcibly—determination to dismember Bengal at all costs, an anxiety to promote the interests of Assam at the expense of Bengal, and a desire to suit everything to the interests and convenience of the Civil Service. It is not merely that a number of new prizes have been thrown into the lap of that Service—one Lieutenant-Governorship, two Memberships of the Board of Revenue, one Commissionership of a Division, several Secretaryships and Under-Secretaryships—but alternative schemes of readjustment have been rejected on the express ground that their adoption would be unpopular with members of the Service. Thus even if a reduction of the charge of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal had really become inevitable—a contention, which the greatest living authority on the subject, Sir Henry Cotton, who was Secretary to the Bengal Government under seven Lieutenant-Governors, does not admit—one would have thought that the most natural course to take was to separate Behar, Orissa and

Chota Nagpur from Bengal and form them into a separate Province. This would have made the Western Province one of 30 millions in place of the Eastern. But this, says the Government of India, "would take from Bengal all its best districts and would make the Province universally unpopular". This was of course a fatal objection, for compared with the displeasure of the Civil Service, the trampling under foot of public opinion and the outraging of the deepest feelings of a whole people was a small matter! But one can see that administrative considerations were really only secondary in the determination of this question. The dismemberment of Bengal had become necessary, because in the view of the Government of India,

"it cannot be for the lasting good of any country or any people that public opinion or what passes for it should be manufactured by a comparatively small number of people at a single centre and should be disseminated thence for universal adoption, all other view being discouraged or suppressed." "From every point of views," the Government further states, "it appears to us desirable to encourage the growth of centres of independent opinion, local aspirations, local ideals and to preserve the growing intelligence and enterprise of Bengal from being cramped and stunted by the process of forcing it prematurely into a mould of rigid and sterile uniformity"

You will see that this is only a paraphrase in Lord Curzon's most approved style, of the complaint of the people of Bengal that their fair Province has been dismembered to destroy their growing solidarity, check their national aspirations and weaken their power of co-operating for national ends, lessen the influence of their educated classes with their countrymen, and reduce the political importance of Calcutta. After this let no apologist of the late Viceroy pretend that the object of the partition was administrative convenience and not political repression!

Gentlemen, it is difficult to speak in terms of due restraint of Lord Curzon's conduct throughout this affair. Having published his earlier and smaller scheme for public criticism, it was his clear duty to publish similarly the later and larger scheme, which he afterwards substituted for it.

But in consequence of the opposition which the first scheme encountered, he abandoned the idea of taking the public any more into his confidence and proceeded to work in the matter in the dark. For more than a year nothing further was heard of his intentions, and while he was silently elaborating the details of his measure, he allowed the impression to prevail that the Government had abandoned the Partition project. And in the end, when he had succeeded in securing the Secretary of State's sanction to the scheme, it was from Simla, where he and his official colleagues were beyond the reach of public opinion, that he sprang the final orders of Government upon an unprepared people. Then suddenly came his resignation. And the people permitted themselves for a while to hope that it would bring them at least a brief respite, especially as Mr. Brodrick had promised shortly before to present further papers on the subject to Parliament and that was understood to mean that the scheme would not be brought into operation till Parliament reassembled at the beginning of next year. Of course, after Lord Curzon's resignation, the only proper, the only dignified course for him was to take no step, which it was difficult to revoke and the consequences of which would have to be faced, not by him, but by his successor; he owed it to Lord Minto to give him an opportunity to examine the question for himself; he owed it to the Royal visitors not to plunge the largest Province of India into violent agitation and grief on the eve of their visit to it. But Lord Curzon was determined to partition Bengal before he left India and so he rushed the necessary legislation through the Legislative Council at Simla, which only the official members could attend, and enforced his orders on 16th October last—a day observed as one of universal mourning by all classes of people in Bengal. And now, while he himself has gone from India, what a sea of troubles he has bequeathed to his successor! Fortunately there are grounds to believe that Lord Minto will deal with the situation with tact, firmness, and sympathy, and it seems he has already pulled up to some extent Lord Curzon's favourite Lieutenant, the first ruler of the new Eastern province. Mr. Fuller has evidently cast to the

winds all prudence, all restraints, all sense of responsibility. Even if a fraction of what the papers have been reporting be true, his extraordinary doing must receive the attention of the new Secretary of State for India and the House of Commons. There is no surer method of goading a docile people into a state of dangerous despair than the kind of hectoring and repression he has been attempting.

But, Gentlemen, as has been well said, even in things evil there is a soul of goodness, and the dark times, through which Bengal has passed and is passing, have not been without a message of bright hope for the future. The tremendous upheaval of popular feeling, which has taken place in Bengal in consequence of the partition, will constitute a landmark in the history of our national progress. For the first time since British rule began, all sections of the Indian community, without distinction of caste or creed, have been moved by a common impulse and without the stimulus of external pressure to act together in offering resistance to a common wrong. A wave of true national consciousness has swept over the Province, and at its touch old barriers have for the time, at any rate, been thrown down, personal jealousies have vanished, other controversies have been hushed! Bengal's heroic stand against the oppression of a harsh and uncontrolled bureaucracy has astonished and gratified all India, and her sufferings have not been endured in vain, when they have helped to draw closer all parts of the country in sympathy and in aspiration. A great rush and uprising of the waters, such as has been recently witnessed in Bengal, cannot take place without a little inundation over the banks here and there. These little excesses are inevitable, when large masses of men move spontaneously—especially when the movement is from darkness unto light, from bondage towards freedom—and they must not be allowed to disconcert us too much. The most outstanding fact of the situation is that the public life of this country has received an accession of strength of great importance, and for this all India owes a deep debt of gratitude to Bengal. Of course, the difficulties which

confront the leaders of Bengal are enormous and perhaps they have only just begun. But I know there is no disposition to shrink from any responsibilities, and I have no doubt that whatever sacrifices are necessary will be cheerfully made. All India is at their back, and they will receive in the work that lies before them the cordial sympathy and assistance of the other Provinces. Any discredit, that is allowed to fall on them, affects us all. They on their side must not forget that the honour of all India is at present in their keeping.

THE SWADESHI MOVEMENT

Gentlemen, I will now say a few words on a movement which has spread so rapidly and has been hailed with so much enthusiasm all over the country during the last few months—the *Swadeshi* movement. It is necessary at the outset to distinguish it from another movement, started in Bengal, which has really given it such immense impetus—the boycott of British goods. We all know that when our Bengali brethren found that nothing would turn the late Viceroy from his purpose of partitioning Bengal, that all their protests in the Press and on the Platform, all their memorials to him, to the Secretary of State and to Parliament were unavailing, that the Government exercised its despotic strength to trample on their most cherished feelings and injure their dearest interests and that no protection against this of any kind was forthcoming from any quarter, they in their extremity resolved to have recourse to this boycott movement. This they did with a two-fold object—first as a demonstration of their deep resentment at the treatment they were receiving; and, secondly, to attract the attention of the people in England to their grievances, so that those who were in a position to call the Government of India to account might understand what was taking place in India. It was thus as a political weapon, used for a definite political purpose, that they had recourse to the boycott; and in the circumstances of their position they had every justification for the step they took. And I can tell you from personal experience that their action has proved immensely effective

in drawing the attention of English people to the state of things in our country. But a weapon like this must be reserved only for extreme occasions. There are obvious risks involved in its failure, and it cannot be used with sufficient effectiveness unless there is an extraordinary upheaval of popular feeling behind it. It is bound to rouse angry passions on the other side, and no true well-wisher of his country will be responsible for provoking such passions, except under an overpowering sense of necessity. On an extreme occasion, of course, a boycotting demonstration is perfectly legitimate, but that occasion must be one to drive all classes, as in Bengal, to act with one impulse, and make all leaders sink their personal differences in the presence of a common danger. It is well to remember that the term "boycott" owing to its origin, has got unsavoury associations, and it conveys to the mind before everything else a vindictive desire to injure another. Such a desire on our part, as a normal feature of our relations with England, is of course out of the question. Moreover, if the boycott is confined to British goods only, it leaves us free to purchase the goods of other foreign countries and this does not help the *Swadeshi* movement in any way.

Gentlemen, the true *Swadeshi* movement is both a patriotic and an economic movement. The idea of *Swadeshi* or "one's own country" is one of the noblest conceptions that have ever stirred the heart of humanity. As the poet asks—

Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,—
This is my own, my native land !

The devotion to Motherland, which is enshrined in the highest *Swadeshi*, is an influence so profound and so passionate that its very thought thrills and its actual touch lifts one out of oneself. India needs to-day above everything else that the gospel of this devotion should be preached to high and low, to prince and to peasant, in town and in hamlet, till the service of Motherland becomes

with us as overmastering a passion as it is in Japan. The *Swadeshi* movement, as it is ordinarily understood, presents one part of this gospel to the mass of our people in a form, which brings it within their comprehension. It turns their thoughts to their country, accustoms them to the idea of voluntarily making some sacrifice for her sake, enables them to take an intelligent interest in her economic development and teaches them the important lesson of co-operating with one another for a national end. All this is most valuable work, and those who undertake it are entitled to feel that they are engaged in a highly patriotic mission. But the movement on its material side is an economic one; and though self-denying ordinances, extensively entered into, must serve a valuable economic purpose, namely, to ensure a ready consumption of such articles as are produced in the country and to furnish a perpetual stimulus to production by keeping the demand for indigenous things largely in excess of the supply, the difficulties that surround the question economically are so great that they require the co-operation of every available agency to surmount them. The problem is indeed one of the first magnitude. Twelve years ago, the late Mr. Ranade remarked at an Industrial Conference held at Poona :

The political domination of one country by another attracts far more attention than the more formidable, though unfelt domination, which the capital, enterprise and skill of one country exercise over the trade and manufactures of another. This latter domination has an insidious influence, which paralyzes the springs of all the varied activities, which together make up the life of a nation.

The question of production is a question of capital, enterprise and skill, and in all these factors, our deficiency at present is very great. Whoever can help in any one of these fields is, therefore, a worker in the *Swadeshi* cause and should be welcomed as such. Not by methods of exclusion but by those of comprehension, not by insisting on everyone working in the same part of the field but by leaving each one free to select his own corner, by attracting to the cause all who are likely to help and not

alienating any who are already with us, are the difficulties of the problem likely to be overcome. Above all, let us see to it that there are no fresh divisions in the country in the name of *Swadeshi*. No greater perversion of its true spirit could be imagined than that.

Take the question of cotton piece-goods, of which we import at present over 22 millions sterling worth a year. This is by far the heaviest item among our imports and our present *Swadeshi* agitation is directed mainly towards producing as much of these goods in our own country as possible. I have consulted three of the best experts available in India on this subject—Mr. Bezanji of Nagpur, the right hand man of the late Mr. Tata in mill matters, the Hon. Mr. Vithaldas Damodardas, who has written an admirable paper on the cotton industry for the Industrial Conference and has kindly placed a copy of it at my disposal, and our friend Mr. Wacha. They are all agreed about the requirements and the difficulties of the situation. So far as cotton fabrics are concerned, even strict Free Traders should have nothing to say against the encouragement which the *Swadeshi* movement seeks to give to their manufacture in India. In the first place, many of the usual objections that may be urged against a system of State protection do not apply to helpful voluntary action on the part of consumers, such as the *Swadeshi* movement endeavours to promote. Moreover, the essence of Free Trade is that a commodity should be produced where the comparative cost of its production is the least and that it should be consumed where its relative value is the highest; and if accidental circumstances have thwarted such an adjustment in a given case, any agency which seeks to overcome the impediment works in the end in the interests of true Free Trade. Now everyone will admit that with cheap labour and cotton at her own door, India enjoys exceptional advantages for the manufacture of cotton goods; and if the *Swadeshi* movement helps her to regain her natural position in this respect—a position which she once occupied but out of which she has been driven by an extraordinary combination of

circumstances—the movement works not against but in furtherance of true Free Trade. Even at present the cotton industry in India is an important one. It is the largest industry after agriculture in the country; it is also the only one—agriculture excepted—in which the Indians themselves have a substantial share. It is represented by a paid-up capital of about 17 crores of rupees or a little over 11 millions sterling, the number of mills being about 200, with five million spindles and fifty thousand power-looms. In addition to this, there are, according to the census of 1901, about a quarter of a million persons engaged in hand-loom weaving in the country. Our mills consume nearly 60 per cent. of the cotton produce of India and produce 58 crore lbs. of yarn. Of this quantity, Mr. Vithaldas tells us, about $23\frac{1}{2}$ crore lbs. is exported to China and other foreign countries, about $13\frac{1}{2}$ crores is used in our weaving mills, and about 19 crores is woven by hand-loom weavers, the remaining 2 crores going to the manufacture of rope and twine. In addition to this, 3 crore lbs. of yarn is imported from the United Kingdom and is consumed by the hand-looms. The hand-loom industry of the country thus absorbs, in spite of its hard struggles, about 22 crore lbs. of yarn, or nearly double the quantity woven by power-looms, and this is a most interesting and significant fact. The yarn used by the weaving mills produces about 55 crores of yards of cloth, of which about 14 crore yards is exported to foreign countries and about 41 crores is left for consumption in the country. If we put down the production of the hand-looms at about 90 crore yards, we have about 130 crore yards as the quantity of *Swadeshi* cloth consumed at present in India.

The quantity of piece-goods imported from the United Kingdom and retained for use in the country is about 205 crore yards a year. Of the total cloth consumed, therefore, over one-third is at present *Swadeshi*. This is an encouraging feature of the situation. But the imported cloth is almost all superior in quality.

"While our mills," Mr. Vithaldas says, "produce the coarser cloth say, from yarn up to 30's count and in a few cases up to 40's, the bulk of the imported cloth is of the finer quality, using yarn

over 30's count. The Indian weaving mills are obliged to restrict themselves for the most part to weaving coarser cloth owing to the inferior quality of cotton now grown in the country."

It may be noted that even from existing cotton, hand-loomers can, owing to their greater delicacy of handling the yarn, produce finer cloth than the power-loomers. Fortunately owing to the exertions of the Agricultural Department of the Bombay Government—exertions for which it is entitled to the best thanks of the whole country—Egyptian cotton has just been successfully introduced into Sind, and this year a thousand bales of a quality equal to very good Egyptian have been produced. A much heavier crop is expected next year, and there is no doubt that its cultivation will rapidly extend. The main difficulty in the way of our manufacturing the quality of cloth that is at present imported is one of capital. Mr. Wacha estimates that if the whole quantity of 205 crore yards is to be produced by mills, the industry requires an additional capital of about 30 crores of rupees. Even if we propose to spread this over ten years, we should require an addition of 3 crores of rupees every year. Now if we turn to the Statistical Abstract of British India, we shall find that the total increase in the capital invested in cotton mills during the last ten years has been only about 3 crores—an amount that Mr. Wacha wants every year for ten years. The normal development of the mill industry is thus plainly unequal to the requirements of the situation. Moreover it is well to remember what Mr. Bezanji says—that the present millowners must not be expected to be very keen about the production of finer cloth, because its manufacture is much less paying than that of the coarser cloth. This is due to various causes, the principal one among them being that English capital, similarly invested, is satisfied with a smaller range of profits. Capital from other quarters must, therefore, be induced to come forward and undertake this business. If we again turn to the Statistical Abstract, we shall find that our people hold about 50 crores of rupees in Government Securities and about 11 crores in Postal Savings Banks. The private deposits stand at about 32 crores of rupees, but there are

no means of ascertaining how much of the amount is held by Indians. Considering the extent of the country and the numbers of the population, these resources are, of course, extremely meagre. Still they might furnish some part of the capital needed. In this connection may I say that a special responsibility now rests in the matter on the Aristocracy of Bengal ! And this not merely because the *Swadeshi* movement is being so vigorously advocated in their Province, but also because owing to the Permanent Settlement of Bengal they are enabled to enjoy resources, which in other parts of India are swept into the coffers of the State. If sufficient capital is forthcoming, Mr. Bezanji's patriotism may, I am sure, be relied on to secure for the undertaking whatever assistance his great capacity and unrivalled knowledge can give. It must, however, be admitted that capital will come forward only cautiously for this branch of the business. But the hand-loom is likely to prove of greater immediate service. Mr. Vithaldas looks forward to a great revival of the hand-loom industry in the country, and I cannot do better than quote what he says on this point in his paper :—

This village industry, he says, gives means of livelihood not only to an immense number of the weaver class but affords means of supplementing their income to agriculturists—the backbone of India—who usually employ themselves on hand-loom, when field work is unnecessary and also when, owing to famine drought or excessive rains, agricultural operations are not possible. Now the apparatus with which they work is nearly two centuries behind the times. Mr. Havell, Principal of the Calcutta School of Arts ; Mr. Chatterton of the Madras School of Arts, and Mr. Churchill of Bangalore, along with many others, are doing yeoman's service by taking keen interest in the question of supplying economical and improved apparatus to the hand-loom weavers. Mr. Havell has pointed out that in preparing the warp our hand-loom weavers are incapable of winding more than two threads at a time, though the simplest mechanical device would enable them to treat 50 or 100 threads simultaneously. The latest European hand-loom, which successfully competes with the power-loom in Cairo and in many places in Europe, can turn out a maximum of 48 yards of common cloth in a day. Mr. Havell is satisfied that the greater portion of the imported cotton cloth can be made in the Indian hand-loom with great profit to the whole community. The question of the immediate revival of the hand-loom weaving industry on a commercial basis demands the most earnest attention of every

well-wisher of India, and evidence gives promise of a successful issue to efforts put forward in this direction.

The outlook here is thus hopeful and cheering; only we must not fail to realise that the co-operation of all who can help—including the Government—is needed to overcome the difficulties that lie in the path.

OUR AIMS AND ASPIRATIONS

Gentlemen, this is the twenty-first session of the Indian National Congress. Year after year, since 1885, we have been assembling in these gatherings to give voice to our aspirations and to formulate our wants. When the movement was first inaugurated, we were under the influence of that remarkable outburst of enthusiasm for British Rule, which had been evoked in the country by the great Viceroyalty of the Marquis of Ripon. The best beloved of India's Viceroys was not content to offer mere lip-homage to the principle that righteousness alone exalteth a nation. He had dared to act on it in practice, and he had braved persecution at the hands of his own countrymen in India for its sake. Lord Ripon's noblest service to this country was that he greatly quickened the processes by which the consciousness of a national purpose comes to establish itself in the minds of a people. The Congress movement was the direct and immediate outcome of this realisation. It was started to focus and organize the patriotic forces that were working independently of one another in different parts of the country, so as to invest their work with a national character and to increase their general effectiveness. Hope at that time was warm and faith shone bright largely as a result of Lord Ripon's Viceroyalty, and those who started the Congress believed that by offering their criticism and urging their demands from a national platform, where they could speak in the name of all India, they would be able to secure a continuous improvement of the administration and a steady advance in the direction of the political emancipation of the people. Twenty years have since elapsed and during the time much has happened to chill that hope and dim that faith, but there can be no doubt that work of great value in our national life has

already been accomplished. The minds of the people have been familiarized with the idea of a united India working for her salvation ; a national public opinion has been created ; close bonds of sympathy now knit together the different Provinces ; caste and creed separations hamper less and less the pursuit of common aims ; the dignity of a consciousness of a national existence has spread over the whole land. Our record of political concessions won is, no doubt, very meagre, but those that have been secured are of considerable value ; some retrogression has been prevented ; and if latterly we have been unable to stem the tide of reaction, the resistance we have offered, though it has failed of its avowed purpose, has substantially strengthened our public life. Our deliberations have extended over a very wide range of problems ; public opinion in the country is, in consequence, better informed, and the Press is steadily growing in authority and usefulness. Above all, there is a general perception now of the goal towards which we have to strive and a wide recognition of the arduous character of the struggle and the immense sacrifices it requires.

The goal of the Congress is that India should be governed in the interests of the Indians themselves, and that in course of time a form of government should be attained in this country similar to what exists in the self-governing Colonies of the British Empire. For better, for worse, our destinies are now linked with those of England and the Congress freely recognises that whatever advance we seek must be within the Empire itself. That advance, moreover, can only be gradual, as at each stage of the progress it may be necessary for us to pass through a brief course of apprenticeship before we are enabled to go to the next one ; for it is a reasonable proposition that the sense of responsibility, required for the proper exercise of the political institutions of the West, can be acquired by an Eastern people through practical training and experiment only. To admit this is not to express any agreement with those who usually oppose all attempts of reform on the plea that the people are not ready for it.

It is liberty alone, says Mr. Gladstone in words of profound wisdom, which fits men for liberty. This proposition, like every other in politics, has its bounds; but it is far safer than the counter doctrine: 'Wait till they are fit.'

While, therefore, we are prepared to allow that an advance towards our goal may be only by reasonably cautious steps, what we emphatically insist on is that the resources of the country should be primarily devoted to the work of qualifying the people by means of education and in other ways for such advance. Even the most bigoted champion of the existing system of administration will not pretend that this is in any degree the case at present. Our net revenue is about 44 millions sterling. Of this very nearly one-half is now eaten up by the Army. The Home Charges, exclusive of their military portion, absorb nearly one-third. These two between them account for about 34 millions out of 44. Then over three millions are paid to European officials in civil employ. This leaves only about 7 millions at the disposal of the Government to be applied to other purposes. Can any one, who realizes what this means, wonder that the Government spends only a miserable three-quarters of a million out of State Funds on the education of the people—primary, secondary and higher, all put together. Japan came under the influence of Western ideas only forty years ago, and yet already she is in a line with the most advanced nations of the West in matters of mass education, the State finding funds for the education of every child of school-going age. We have now been a hundred years under England's Rule, and yet to-day four villages out of every five are without a school-house and seven children out of eight are allowed to grow up in ignorance and in darkness! Militarism, Service interests and the interests of capitalists—all take precedence to-day of the true interests of the Indian people in the administration of the country. Things cannot be otherwise, for it is the government of the people of one country by the people of another, and this, as Mill points out, is bound to produce great evils. Now the Congress wants that all this should change and that India should be governed, first, and foremost, in

the interests of the Indians themselves. This result will be achieved only in proportion as we obtain more and more voice in the government of our country. We are prepared to bear—and bear cheerfully—our fair share of the burdens of the Empire, of which we are now a part but we want to participate in the privileges also, and we object most strongly to being sacrificed, as at present, in order that others may prosper. Then the Congress asks for a redemption of those promises for the equal treatment of Indians and Englishmen in the government of this country which have been solemnly given us by the Sovereign and the Parliament of England. It is now three quarters of a century since the Parliament passed an Act, which, the Court of Directors pointed out, meant that there was to be no governing caste in India. The governing caste, however, is still as vigorous, as exclusive as ever. Twenty-five years later, the late Queen-Empress addressed a most memorable Proclamation to the Princes and Peoples of India. The circumstances connected with the issue of that Proclamation and its noble contents will always bear witness to the true greatness of that great Sovereign and will never cease to shed lustre on the English name. The Proclamation repeats the pledges contained in the Charter Act of 1833, and though an astounding attempt was made less than two years ago by the late Viceroy to explain away its solemn import, the plain meaning of the Royal message cannot be altered without attributing what is nothing less than an unworthy subterfuge to a Sovereign, the deep reverence for whose memory is an asset of the Empire. That the Charter Act of 1833 and the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 have created in the eyes of reactionary rulers a most inconvenient situation is clear from a blunt declaration, which another Viceroy of India, the late Lord Lytton, made in a confidential document, which has since seen the light of day. Speaking of our claims and expectations based on the pledges of the Sovereign and the Parliament, he wrote:—

We all know that these claims and expectations never can or will be fulfilled. We have had to choose between prohibiting them (the natives of India) and cheating them and we have chosen

the least straightforward course Since I am writing confidentially, I do not hesitate to say that both the Government of England and of India appear to me up to the present moment unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they had uttered to the ear.

We accept Lord Lytton as an unimpeachable authority on the conduct of the Government in evading the fulfilment of the pledges. We deny his claim to lay down that our "claims and expectations never can or will be fulfilled".

Our whole future, it is needless to say, is bound up with this question of the relative position of the two races in this country. The domination of one race over another, especially when there is no great disparity between their intellectual endowment or their general civilization, inflicts great injury on the subject race in a thousand insidious ways. On the moral side, the present situation is steadily destroying our capacity for initiative and dwarfing us as men of action. On the material side, it has resulted in a fearful impoverishment of the people. For a hundred years and more now India has been for members of the dominant race, a country where fortunes were to be made to be taken out and spent elsewhere. As in Ireland, the evil of absentee landlordism has in the past aggravated racial domination of the English over the Irish, so in India what may be called absentee capitalism has been added to the racial ascendancy of Englishmen. A great and ruinous drain of wealth from the country has gone on for many years, the net excess of exports over imports (including treasure) during the last forty years amounting to no less than a thousand millions sterling. The steady rise in the death-rate of the country—from 24 per thousand, the average for 1882-84, to 30 per thousand, the average for 1892-94, and 34 per thousand, the present average—is a terrible and conclusive proof of this continuous impoverishment of the mass of our people. India's best interests—material and moral—no less than the honour of England, demand that the policy of equality.

for the two races promised by the Sovereign and by Parliament should be faithfully and courageously carried out.

THE BUREAUCRACY

Gentlemen, as I have already observed, the manner in which the Partition of Bengal has been carried out furnishes a striking illustration of the worst features of the present system of bureaucratic rule. Happily these features are not always so conspicuously in evidence. No one also denies that a large proportion of the members of the bureaucracy bring to their work a high level of ability, a keen sense of duty and a conscientious desire, within the limits of the restricted opportunities permitted by the predominance of other interests, to do what good they can to the people. It is the system that is really at fault—a system which relegates the interests of the people to a very subordinate place and which, by putting too much power into the hands of these men, impairs their sense of responsibility and develops in them a spirit of intolerance of criticism. I know many of these men are on their side constantly smarting under a sense of unfair condemnation by our countrymen. They fail to realize that if the criticism that is passed on their actions is sometimes ill-informed and even unjust, this is largely due to the veil of secrecy which carefully hides official proceedings from the view of the people in India. Moreover, theirs are at present all the privileges of the position, and they must bear without impatience or bitterness its few disadvantages. I have already said that our advance towards our goal can only be gradual. Meanwhile, there is a great deal of work to be done for the country in which officials and non-officials could join hands. A considerable part of the way we could both go together, but it can be only on terms consistent with the self-respect of either side. In old times, when British Rule was new and its higher standard and its more vigorous purposes excited general admiration, the Englishman's claim to a privileged position, even outside the sphere of official duties, was allowed to pass unchallenged. That is now no longer possible and those officials, who expect the Indians to approach them with

bated breath and whispering humbleness—and the type is not confined to the new Eastern Province exclusively—not only make useful relations between the two sides impossible but do more harm to their own class than they imagine. In one respect the gulf between the official and educated classes of the country is bound to widen more and more every day. The latter now clearly see that the bureaucracy is growing frankly selfish and openly hostile to their national aspirations. It was not so in the past. In a most remarkable letter which I had the honour to receive while in England two months ago, from Mr. Hodgson Pratt—a great and venerated name among all lovers of peace—he tells us with what object Western education was introduced into this country.

Fifty years ago, writes Mr. Pratt, who in those days was a member of the Bengal Civil Service, while India was still under the government of the East India Company, it was considered both just and wise to introduce measures for national education on a liberal scale, with adequate provision, of schools colleges, and universities. This event was hailed with lively satisfaction by the native population as heralding a new era of social progress, and as satisfying the active intelligence of the Hindus. Now it must be observed that character of the teaching thus inaugurated by Englishmen would necessarily reflect the ideals which have for centuries prevailed among them. In other words, Indian youths would be brought up to admire our doctrines of political liberty, popular rights, and national independence; nor could it ever have been supposed that these lessons would fall upon deaf ears and cold hearts. On the contrary, the inevitable result of such teaching was clearly perceived by the Government of those days, and was regarded in a generous spirit. In support of this assertion I may mention that at the time of the inauguration of these measures I accompanied the then Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal (Sir Frederick Halliday) on one of his winter tours through the province. Naturally he called the attention of those who attended the public meetings held by him to the new education policy, and he always took occasion to declare that the schools would promote one of the leading purposes of British Rule, *which was to prepare the people for Self-Government*. It certainly was not supposed that at any subsequent time a policy would be adopted which would disappoint the legitimate hopes thus created.

Now, however, that the time has come for the bureaucracy, to part with some of its power in favour of the

educated classes, all kinds of excuses are brought forward to postpone what is no doubt regarded as the evil day. One favourite argument is that the educated classes are as yet only a very small fraction of the community. The hollowness of this plea was well exposed by the late Mr. George Yule in his address as President of our National Congress in 1888. Quoting Prof. Thorold Rogers, he pointed out that a hundred years ago, not one man in ten or one woman in twenty knew how to read and write in England. Going another century or two back, he added, the people of England, man and boy, high and low with the exception of a mere handful, were steeped in the grossest ignorance and yet there was a House of Commons. We have now in this country about 15 million people who can read and write, and about a million of these have come under the influence of some kind of English education. Moreover what we ask for at present is a voice in the government of the country, not for the whole population, but for such portion of it as has been qualified by education to discharge properly the responsibilities of such association. Another argument brought forward in favour of maintaining the present bureaucratic monopoly of power is that though the educated classes make a grievance of it, the mass of the people are quite indifferent in the matter. Now, in the first place, this is not true. However it may suit the interests of the officials to deny the fact, the educated classes are in the present circumstances of India the natural leaders of the people. Theirs is the vernacular press, the contents of which do not fail to reach the mass of our population ; in a hundred ways they have access to the minds of the latter ; and what the educated Indians think to-day, the rest of India thinks to-morrow. Moreover do the officials realize how their contention condemns their rule out of their own mouth ? For it means that only so long as the people of India are kept in ignorance and their faculties are forced to lie dormant that they do not raise any objection to the present system of administration. The moment education quickens those faculties and clears their vision, they range themselves against a continuance of the system !

OUR IMMEDIATE DEMANDS

Gentlemen, a number of important questions will come up before you for discussion during the next two days, and following the practice of previous Congresses, you will no doubt record after due deliberation your views on them in the form of resolutions. This is of course necessary; but may I suggest that for purposes of effective agitation in the immediate future, we should now concentrate our main energies on certain selected portions of our programme? Speaking broadly, most of the reforms that we have been advocating may be grouped under four heads:—(1) Those which aim at securing for our people a larger and larger share in the administration and control of our affairs; these include a reform of our Legislative Councils, the appointment of Indians to the Secretary of State's Council and the Executive Councils in India, and a steady substitution of the Indian for the European agency in the public service of the country; (2) those which seek to improve the methods of administration, such as the separation of Judicial from Executive functions, Police reform, and so forth; (3) those which propose a readjustment of financial arrangements with the object of securing a reduction of the burdens of the taxpayers and a more efficient application of our resources; under this head come a reduction of military charges, the moderating of land-assessments and so forth; and (4) those which urge the adoption of measures calculated to improve the condition of the mass of the people; these include a vigorous extension of primary education, facilities for industrial and technical instruction, grants for improved sanitation, and a real attempt to deal with the alarming indebtedness of the peasantry. Now what I would most earnestly and respectfully suggest is that we would select from each group such reforms as may be immediately urged with the greatest effect and press them forward in this country and in England with all the energy we can command. In my humble opinion our immediate demands should be:—

(1) A reform of our Legislative Councils, raising the proportion of elected members to one-half, requiring

the Budgets to be formally passed by the Councils and empowering the members to bring forward amendments with safeguards for bringing the debates to a close in a reasonable time. The Presidents of the Council should have the power of veto. The Viceroy's Legislative Council consists at present of 25 members of whom only 5 are elected, one by the Chamber of Commerce of Calcutta—a body of Europeans—and the other four by four provinces. We must ask for the proportion of elected members to be now raised to 12. Of this number, two seats may be given, one to commerce and one to certain industries, and the remaining ten should be assigned to different provinces, two to each of the three older provinces, and one each to the remaining. And, to begin with, the right of members to move amendments may be confined to one amendment each. The two members for Commerce and Industries will generally be Europeans, and they will ordinarily vote with Government. Thus even if all the ten provincial members voted together, they would be only 10 out of 25. Ordinarily, they will not be able to carry a motion against the Government, but on exceptional occasions they may obtain the support of two or three men from the other side and then the moral effect of the situation will be considerable. In the Provincial Legislative Councils, we must have an increase in the number, each district of a province being empowered to send a member. The objection that these bodies will in that case be somewhat unwieldy is not entitled to much weight.

(2) The appointment of at least three Indians to the Secretary of State's Council to be returned one each by the three older provinces.

(3) The creation of Advisory Boards in all Districts throughout India, whom the heads of districts should be bound to consult in important matters of administration concerning the public before taking action. For the present their functions should be only advisory, the Collector or District Magistrate being at liberty to set aside their advice at their discretion. Half the members

of a Board should be elected representatives of the different Talukas or Sub-Divisions of the District and the other half should consist of the principal District Officers and such non-official gentlemen as the head of the district may appoint. The Boards must not be confounded with what are known as District Local Boards. There is at present too much of what may be called Secretariat rule, with an excessive multiplication of central departments. District administration must be largely freed from this and reasonable opportunities afforded to the people concerned to influence its course before final decisions are arrived at. If such Boards are created, we may in course of time expect them to be entrusted with some real measure of control over the District administration. The late Mr. Ranade used to urge the importance of such Boards very strongly. If ever we are to have real Local Government in matters of general administration, the creation of these Boards will pave the way for it. One great evil of the present system of administration is its secrecy. This will be materially reduced, so far as District administration is concerned, by the step proposed.

(4) The recruitment of the Judicial Branch of the Indian Civil Service from the legal profession in India.

(5) The separation of Judicial and Executive functions.

(6) A reduction of Military expenditure.

(7) A large extension of primary education.

(8) Facilities for industrial and technical education.

(9) An experimental measure to deal with the indebtedness of the peasantry over a selected area.

I think, Gentlemen, if we now concentrate all our energies on some such programme, we may within a reasonable time see results which will not be altogether disappointing. One thing is clear. The present is a specially favourable juncture for such an effort. In our own country, there is sure to be a great rebound of public

opinion after the repression to which it has been subjected during the last three years. And in England for the first time since the Congress movement began, the Liberal and Radical Party will come into real power. My recent visit to England, during which I enjoyed somewhat exceptional opportunities to judge of the situation, has satisfied me that a strong current has already set in there against that narrow and aggressive Imperialism which only the other day seemed to be carrying everything before it. The new Prime Minister is a tried and trusted friend of freedom. And as regards the new Secretary of State for India, what shall I say? Large numbers of educated men in this country feel towards Mr. Morley as towards a master, and the heart hopes and yet trembles as it had never hoped or trembled before. He the reverent student of Burke, the disciple of Mill, the friend and biographer of Gladstone—will he courageously apply their principles and his own to the government of this country, or will he, too, succumb to the influences of the India Office around him and thus cast a cruel blight on hopes which his own writings have done so much to foster? We shall see; but in any case his appointment as Secretary of State for India indicates how strongly favourable to our cause the attitude of the new Ministry is. Mr. Ellis, the new Under-Secretary of State for India, is openly known to be a friend of our aspirations. A more gratifying combination of circumstances could not be conceived, and it now rests with us to turn it to the best advantage we can for our Motherland.

CONCLUSION

Gentlemen, one word more and I have done. I have no wish to underrate the difficulties that lie in our path, but I am convinced more than ever that they are not insuperable. Moreover, the real moral interest of a struggle such as we are engaged in lies not so much in the particular readjustments of present institutions which we may succeed in securing, as in the strength that the conflict brings us to be a permanent part of ourselves. The whole life of a people, which is broader and deeper than what is touched by purely political institutions,

is enriched even by failures, provided the effort has been all that it should be. For such enrichment the present struggle is invaluable.

The true end of our work, said Mr. Ranade nine years ago, is to renovate, to purify, and also to perfect the whole man by liberating his intellect, elevating his standard of duty and developing to the full all its powers. Till so renovated, purified and perfected, we can never hope to be what our ancestors once were—a chosen people, to whom great tasks were allotted and by whom great deeds were performed. Where this feeling animates the worker, it is a matter of comparative indifference in what particular direction it asserts itself and in what particular method it proceeds to work. With a liberated manhood, with buoyant hope, with a faith that never shirks duty, with a sense of justice that deals fairly by all, with unclouded intellect and powers fully cultivated, and, lastly, with a love that overleaps all bounds, renovated India will take her proper rank among the nations of the world, and be the master of the situation and of her own destiny. This is the goal to be reached—this is the Promised Land. Happy are they who see it in distant vision, happier those who are permitted to work and clear the way on to it, happiest they who live to see it with their eyes and tread upon the holy soil once more. Famine and pestilence, oppression and sorrow, will then be myths of the past, and the gods will then again descend to the earth and associate with men as they did in times which we now call mythical.

Gentlemen, I can add nothing that may be worthy of being placed by the side of these beautiful words. I will only call to your minds the words of another great teacher of humanity who asks us to keep our faith in spite of trying circumstances, and warns us against the presumption of despairing because we do not see the whole clearly before our eyes:—

Our times are in His hand
Who saith: 'A whole I planned,
Youth shows but half; trust God; see all, nor be afraid.'

Twenty-second Congress—Calcutta—1906

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI

INTRODUCTION

RAJA PEARI MOHUN MUKERJEE, Dr. Rasubehari Ghose, and my friends,—I thank you from the bottom of my heart for proposing me to be the President of the Indian National Congress on this occasion. You may rest assured that I feel from the bottom of my heart the honour that you have done me and in my humble way I would fulfil the important duty you have called me to perform. I cannot undertake at present to read my whole address though I expected I would be able to do so. I would ask my friend Mr. Gokhale to read it for me. I would just make the beginning and say that I thank you most sincerely for honouring me for the third time by electing me to the Presidentship of the Indian National Congress. I hope I shall have your co-operation, help and support. I am obliged to express my deep sorrow at the losses which the country has sustained by the deaths of Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Mr. Anand Mohan Bose, Mr. Budruddin Tyabji and Mr. M. Veeraraghava Chariar.

Mr. Gokhale then read the following Presidential Address at the request of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji :—

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

“Good Government could never be a substitute for government by the people themselves.”—*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling, 23-11-1905.*

“But this I do say that political principles are after all the root of our national greatness, strength and hope.”—*Mr. John Morley, King's Hall, Holborn, 4-6-1901.*

"But if you meddle wrongly with economic things, Gentlemen, be very sure you are then going to the very life, to the heart, to the core of your national existence."—*Free-Trade Hall, Manchester, 19-10-1903.*

Ladies and Gentlemen,—I thank you most sincerely for honouring me for the third time with the Presidentship of the Indian National Congress. I hope I shall have your cordial help and support.

I may here express my deep sorrow at the loss India has suffered in the deaths of Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Justice Budruddin Tyabji, Mr. Anand Mohan Bose and Mr. Veeraraghava Chariar.

I offer my sincere thanks to the "Parliament Branch of the United Irish League," the Breakfast Meeting, the North Lambeth Liberal and Radical Club, and the National Democratic League for their enthusiastic and cordial god-speed to me.

This is the first Congress after its having come of age. It is time that we should carefully consider what the position of the Indians is at present and what their future should be.

In considering this important matter, I do not intend to repeat my lamentations over the past. I want only to look to the future.

The work of the Congress consists of two parts :—

First and most important is the question of the policy and principles of the system of government under which India ought to be governed in the future.

Second is to watch the operation of the administration as it now exists, to propose from time to time any reforms and changes that may be deemed necessary to be made in the various departments, till the present system of government is radically altered and based upon right principles and policy in the accomplishment of the first part mentioned above.

I desire to devote my address mainly to the first part of the work of the Congress, *viz.*, the policy and principles which ought to govern India in future.

What position do the Indians hold in the British Empire? Are they British citizens or not is my first question? I say we are British citizens and are entitled to and claim all British citizen's rights.

I shall first lay before you my reasons for claiming that we are British citizens.

REASON I. THE BIRTHRIGHT

The acknowledgment of this birthright was declared on the very first occasion when England obtained the very first territorial and sovereign possession in India. The British statesmen of the day at once acted upon the fundamental basis of the British constitution and character that any one who came howsoever and wheresoever, under the British flag, was a free British citizen "as if born and living in England".

The fundamental basis in the words of the present Prime Minister is :—

Freedom is the very breath of our life. . . . We stand for liberty, our policy is the policy of freedom.

In the words of Mr. Morley :—

Yes, Gentlemen, the sacred word "free" which represents as Englishmen have always thought until to-day the noblest aspiration that can animate the breast of man.

This birthright to be "free" or to have freedom is our right from the very beginning of our connection with England when we came under the British flag.

When Bombay was acquired as the very first territorial possession, the Government of the day in the very first grant of territorial rights to the East India Company declared thus :

Extract from the "Grant to the First East India Company of the Island of Bombay, dated 24th March 1669." :—

And it is declared that all persons being His Majesty's subjects inhabiting within the said island and their children and their posterity born within the limits thereof shall be deemed free denizens and natural subjects "as if living and born in England".

And further all the terms of the first grant are extended in it to all future British territorial acquisitions. Thus is the claim of Indians to be "free" and to all the rights of British natural subjects "as if living and born in England" are distinctly acknowledged and declared from the very first political connection with England.

Having given the declaration made some two and a half centuries back in the 17th century that the moment we Indians came under the British flag we were "free" citizens, I next give you what two of the prominent statesmen of this the 20th century have said. When the Boers were defeated and subjugated, and came under the British flag, the present Prime Minister said on the 14th June 1901 :

These people with whom we are dealing are not only going to be our fellow-citizens ; they are our fellow-citizens already.

Sir William Harcourt at the same time said :

This is the way in which you propose to deal with your fellow-citizens.

Thus the moment a people came under the British flag they are "free" and British "fellow-citizens". We Indians have been free British citizens as our birthright, "as if born and living in England" from the first moment we came under the British Flag.

The Boer War cost Britain more than two hundred millions and 20,000 dead, and 20,000 wounded. India, on the other hand, has enriched Britain instead of costing anything—and yet this is a strange contrast. The Boers have already obtained self-government in a few years after conquest, while India has not yet received self-government though it is more than 200 years from the commencement of the political connection.

All honour and glory to the British instincts and principles and to the British statesmen of the 17th century. The Liberals of the present day and the Liberal Government have every right to be proud of those "old principles" and now that a happy and blessed revival of

those sacred old principles has taken place, the present Government ought fairly to be expected to act upon those old principles, and to acknowledge and give effect to the birthright of Indians "as if living and born in England". England is bound to do this. Our British rights are beyond all question. Every British Indian subject has franchise in England as a matter of course, and even to become a Member of Parliament. Nobody in England dreams of objecting to it. Once in my case, from party motives, an objection was suggested to entering my name on the register as an elector, and the revising barrister at once brushed aside the objection, for that as an Indian, I was a British citizen.

REASON II, PLEDGED RIGHTS

The grant to the first East India Company cited in Reason I, is both a declaration of the rights of Indians as British citizens as well as a pledge of those rights by that declaration.

Queen Victoria, in her letter to Lord Derby asking him to write the Proclamation himself, said :

And point out the privileges which the Indians will receive in being placed on an equality with the subjects of the British Crown and prosperity flowing in the train of civilization.

Thereupon the Proclamation then declared and pledged unreservedly and most solemnly calling God to witness and bless :

We hold ourselves bound to the Natives of our Indian Territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to our other subjects, and these obligations by the blessing of Almighty God we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil.

Can there be a more sacred and solemn pledge before God and man ?

On the occasion of the Proclamation of the Queen as Empress of India, she sent a telegram to Lord Lytton which he read in the open Durbar consisting of both Princes and Peoples. In this telegram, the Queen-Empress said :

That from the highest to the humblest all may feel that under our rule, the great principles of liberty, equity and justice are secured to them, and that to promote their happiness, to add to their prosperity and advance their welfare are ever present aims and objects of our Empire.

And it is clear that this object of promoting our happiness, etc., etc., can only be attained by our enjoyment of the principles of liberty, equity and justice, *i.e.*, we must have the British liberty of governing ourselves.

On the occasion of the Jubilee of 1887, the Queen-Empress again pledged and emphasised the pledges of the Proclamation thus :

Allusion is made to the Proclamation issued on the occasion of my assumption of the direct government of India, as the Charter of the liberties of the Princes and Peoples of India. It has always been and will be continued to be my earnest desire that the principles of that Proclamation should be unswervingly maintained.

We are now asking nothing more or less than the liberties of our Charter,—our rights of British citizenship.

The present King-Emperor has pledged :

I shall endeavour to follow the great example of the first Queen-Empress to work for the general well-being of my Indian subjects of all ranks.

Again, the King-Emperor in his speech, on 19th February, 1906, said :

It is my earnest hope that in these Colonies as elsewhere *throughout my dominions* (the italics are mine) the grant of free institutions will be followed by an increasing prosperity and loyalty to the Empire.

And the Prime Minister clinches the whole, that :

Good government could never be a substitute for government by the people themselves.

How much less is then an economically evil government and constitutionally an unconstitutional despotic government, a substitute for self-government—and how much absolutely necessary it is to produce “increasing prosperity and loyalty to the Empire,” by “the grant of free institutions”.

With the solemn pledges I have mentioned above, we have every right to claim an honourable fulfilment of all our British pledged rights. And so we claim all British rights as our birthright and as our solemnly pledged rights. Britain's duty, humanity, honour, instincts and traditions for freedom, solemn pledges, conscience, righteousness, and civilization demand the satisfaction to us of our British rights.

REASON III, REPARATION

All our sufferings and evils of the past centuries demand before God and man a reparation, which we may fairly expect from the present revival of the old noble British instincts of liberty and self-government. I do not enter into our past sufferings as I have already said at the outset.

REASON IV, CONSCIENCE

The British people would not allow themselves to be subjected for a single day to such an unnatural system of government as the one which has been imposed upon India for nearly a century and a half. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman has made a happy quotation from Mr. Bright :

I remember John Bright quoting in the House of Commons on one occasion two lines of a poet with reference to political matters —

There is on Earth a yet diviner thing,
Velled though it be, than Parliament or King.

Then Sir Henry asks :

What is that diviner thing? It is the human conscience inspiring human opinion and human sympathy.

I ask them to extend that human conscience, "the diviner thing", to India in the words of Mr. Morley :

It will be a bad day indeed if we have one conscience for the Mother Country and another conscience for all that vast territory over which your eye does not extend.

And now the next question is : What are the British rights which we have a right to "claim" ?

This is not the occasion to enter into any details or argument. I keep to broad lines :

1. Just as the administration of the United Kingdom in all services, departments and details is in the hands of the people themselves of that country, so should we in India claim that the administration in all services, departments and details should be in the hands of the people themselves of India.

This is not only a matter of right and matter of the aspirations of the educated—important enough as these matters are—but it is far more an absolute necessity as the only remedy for the great inevitable economic evil which Sir John Shore pointed out a hundred and twenty years ago, and which is the fundamental cause of the present drain and poverty. The remedy is absolutely necessary for the material, intellectual, political, social, industrial and every possible progress and welfare of the people of India.

2. As in the United Kingdom and the Colonies all taxation and legislation and the power of spending the taxes are in the hands of the representatives of the people of those countries, so should also be the rights of the people of India.

3. All financial relations between England and India must be just and on a footing of equality, *i.e.*, whatever money India may find towards expenditure in any department—Civil or Military or Naval—to the extent of that share should Indians share in all the benefits of that expenditure in salaries, pensions, emoluments, materials, etc., as a partner in the Empire, as she is always declared to be. We do not ask any favours. We want only justice. Instead of going into any further divisions or details of our rights as British citizens, the whole matter can be compromised in one word—"Self-Government" or *Swaraj* like that of the United Kingdom or the Colonies.

Mr. Morley says very truly and emphatically (Banquet, King's Hall, Holborn, 4th June 1901) :

But this I do say that political principles are after all the root of our national greatness, strength and hope.

So, for India also, there can be no national greatness, strength and hope except by the right political principles of self-government.

Now the next important question is, whether it is practicable to grant these rights of self-government at once or when and in what way? Nobody would, I think, say that the whole present machinery can be suddenly broken up at once and the rights which I have defined of self-government can be at once introduced.

RIGHT NO. I, EMPLOYMENT IN THE PUBLIC SERVICES

The right of placing all administration in every department in the hands of the people of India. Has the time arrived to do anything loyally, faithfully and systematically as a beginning at once, so that it may automatically develop into the full realisation of the right of self-government?

I say,—yes. Not only has the time fully arrived but has arrived long past, to make this beginning. The statesmen of nearly three-quarters of a century ago not only considered the point of making a beginning, not merely made a pious declaration, but they actually passed an Act of Parliament for the purpose. Had that Act been honourably and faithfully fulfilled by the Government from that time to this, both England and India would have been in the position, not of bewailing the present poverty, wretchedness and dissatisfaction of the Indian people, but of rejoicing in the prosperity of India and of still greater prosperity of England herself.

In the thirties of the last century, England achieved the highest glory of civilization by its emancipation of the body and soul of man—by abolishing slavery and by freedom of conscience to enjoy all the rights of British citizenship. During these glorious days of English history, the statesmen of the time did not forget their duty to the people of India. They specially and openly considered the

question of self-government of India not only in connection with Britain, but even with the result of entire independence from Britain. When the Act of 1833 was passed, Macaulay made that memorable speech about the duty of Britain towards India, of which Britain shall for ever be proud. I cannot quote that whole speech here. Every word of it is worth study and consideration from the statesmen of the day. I shall give only a few extracts. He first said :

"I must say that to the last day of my life, I shall be proud of having been one of those who assisted in the framing of the Bill which contains that Clause" . . . "It would be on the most selfish view of the case far better for us that the people of India were well governed and independent of us than ill-governed and subject to us." . . . "We shall never consent to administer the *pousta* (a preparation of opium) to a whole community—to stupify and paralyse a great people, whom God has committed to our charge, for the wretched purpose of rendering them more amenable to our control." . . . "We are free, we are civilized, to little purpose, if we grudge to any portion of the human race an equal measure of freedom and civilization." . . . "I have no fears. The path of duty is plain before us and it is also the path of wisdom of national prosperity, of national honour." . . . "To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens would, indeed, be a title to glory all our own."

Such was the glorious spirit in and auspices under which was enacted in Macaulay's words "that wise, that benevolent, that noble clause" :

That no native of the said territory, nor any natural born subject of His Majesty, resident therein, shall by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office or employment under the said company.

I would not repeat here what I have often stated about this clause. Sufficient to say that simultaneous examinations in India have been declared authoritatively as the only honourable fulfilment of the clause.

Here is, then, the beginning that can be made at once not as a new thing but as one fully considered and settled by Act of Parliament 73 years ago. The power is ready in the hands of the Secretary of State for India to

be put into execution at once without the necessity of any reference to Parliament or any authority.

And, in connection with this step, I would earnestly urge upon the Secretary of State to retrace the pernicious step which has lately been taken in India of abolishing competition for the services to which admission is made directly in India. In England, competition is the basis of all first admissions in all the services, and the same must be the basis in India as the fairest and most in accordance with justice.

This beginning will be the key, the most effective remedy for the chief economic and basic evil of the present system.

Mr. Morley has truly said :

But if you meddle wrongly with economic things, Gentlemen, be very sure you are then going to the very life, to the heart, to the core of your national existence.

And so the economic muddle of the existing policy is going to the life, to the heart, to the core of our national existence. A three-fold wrong is inflicted upon us, *i.e.*, of depriving us of wealth, work and wisdom, of everything, in short, worth living for. And this beginning will begin to strike at the root of the muddle. The reform of the alteration of the services from European to Indian is the keynote of the whole.

On the score of efficiency also foreign service can never be efficient or sufficient. Sir William Hunter has said :

If we are to govern the Indian people efficiently and cheaply, we must govern by means of themselves.

The Duke of Devonshire, as Indian Secretary, has said (23rd August 1883) :

There can in my opinion be very little doubt that India is insufficiently governed.

In the very nature of things it cannot be otherwise.

After the simultaneous examinations are carried on for some years, it will be time to transfer the examinations

altogether to India to complete the accomplishment of the rights (No. 1) of self-government without any disturbance in the smooth working of the administration.

Co-ordinately with this important beginning for Right (No. 1), it is urgent to expedite this object that education must be most vigorously disseminated among the people—free and compulsory primary education, and free higher education of every kind. The Indian people will hail with the greatest satisfaction any amount of expenditure for the purpose of education. It was free education that I had at the expense of the people that made me and others of my fellow-students and subsequent fellow-workers to give their best to the service of the people for the promotion of their welfare.

Education on the one hand, and actual training in administration on the other hand, will bring the accomplishment of self-government far more speedily than many imagine.

Heavy expenditure should be no excuse. In fact, if financial justice, to which I shall refer hereafter, is done in the relations between England and India, there will be ample provision even from the poor revenues of India—and with every addition of Indians in place of Europeans, the resources of India for all necessary purposes will go on increasing.

RIGHT NO. II, REPRESENTATION

In England itself, Parliamentary Government existed for some hundreds of years before even the rich and middle classes and the mass of the people had any voice or vote in it.

Macaulay pointed out in 1831 that the people living in the magnificent palaces surrounding Regent's Park and in other such places were unrepresented. It is only so late as 1832 that the middle classes obtained their vote, and it is only so late as 1885 that most of the mass of the people obtained their franchise. Women have no vote. Adult franchise is yet in struggle.

It is no use telling us, therefore, that a good beginning cannot be made now in India for what Mr. Gladstone called "living representation". The only thing needed is the willingness of the Government. The statesmen at the helm of the present Government are quite competent and able to make a good beginning—such a systematic beginning as that it may naturally in no long time develop itself into full legislatures of self-government like those of the self-governing colonies. I need not go into any details here of the scope and possibilities of representation. The educated and thinking classes in India who have attended English schools and colleges are not the only people to be reckoned with. There is a large body who now are informed of the events of the world and of all British institutions by the vernacular press and literature in their own language.

The peasants of Russia are fit for and obtained the Duma from the greatest autocrat in the world, and the leading statesman, the Prime Minister of the free British Empire, proclaimed to the world: "the Duma is dead, long live the Duma!" Surely the fellow-citizens of that statesman and the free citizens of that Empire by birthright and pledged rights are far more entitled to self-government, a constitutional representative system, than the peasants of Russia. I do not despair. It is futile to tell me that we must wait till all the people are ready. The British people did not so wait for their Parliament. We are not allowed to be fit for 150 years. We can never be fit till we actually undertake the work and the responsibility. While China in the East and Persia in the West of Asia are awakening and Japan has already awakened, and Russia is struggling for emancipation—and all of them despotisms—can the free citizens of the British Indian Empire continue to remain subject to despotism—the people who were among the first civilizers of the world? Modern world owes no little gratitude to these early civilizers of the human race. Are the descendants of the earliest civilizers to remain, in the present times of spreading emancipation, under the

barbarous system of despotism, unworthy of British instincts, principles and civilization ?

RIGHT NO. III, JUST FINANCIAL RELATIONS

This right requires no delay or training. If the British Government wills to do what is just and right, this justice towards self-government can be done at once.

First of all take the European Army expenditure. The Government of India in its despatch of 25th March 1890, says :

Millions of money have been spent on increasing the Army in India, on armaments, and on fortifications to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the invasions of the warlike peoples of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British Power in the East.

Again, the Government of India says :

It would be much nearer the truth to affirm that the Imperial Government keeps in India and quarters upon the revenues of that country as large a portion of its army as it thinks can possibly be required to maintain its dominion there, that it habitually treats that portion of its army as a reserve force available for Imperial purposes ; that it has uniformly detached European regiments from the garrison of India to take part in Imperial wars whenever it has been found necessary or convenient to do so ; and more than this that it has drawn not less freely upon the native army of India towards the maintenance of which it contributes nothing to aid it in contests outside of India with which the Indian Government has had little or no concern.

Such is the testimony of the Government of India that the European Army is for Imperial purposes.

Now I give the view taken in the India Office itself.

Sir James Peile was a member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, and represented the Indian Secretary on the Royal Commission (Welby's) on Indian expenditure. Sir James Peile, in a motion, after pointing out that the military policy which regulated Indian military expenditure was not exclusively Indian, urged that :

It is worthy of consideration how far it is equitable to charge on a dependency the whole military cost, of that policy, when that

dependency happens to be the only part of the Empire which has a land frontier adjacent to the territory of a great European power.

Here then these extracts of the Government of India and the India Office show that the European Army expenditure is entirely for British imperial purposes, and yet with flagrant injustice the burden is thrown by the Treasury upon the helpless Indian people.

• In the same way all the Government expenditure in England which entirely goes to the benefit of the people in England, and which is for British purposes, is imposed on the Indian people while the Colonies do not pay any portion for similar expenditure in England. This expenditure should in common justice not be imposed on India. It is unjust. Here then, if we are relieved of burdens which ought not in common justice to be imposed upon us, our revenues, poor as they are at present, will supply ample means for education and many other reforms and improvements which are needed by us. This question is simply a matter of financial justice. I have put it on a clear just principle and on that principle India can be quite ready to find the money and its own men for all her own needs—Military, Naval, Civil or any other. For imperial expenditure we must have our share in the services in proportion to our contribution.

These just financial relations can be established at once. They require no delay or preparation. It only needs the determination and will of the British Government to do justice. Lastly, as to self-government. If the British people and statesmen make up their mind to do their duty towards the Indian people, they have every ability and statesmanship to devise means to accord self-government within no distant time. If there is the will and the conscience, there is the way.

Now I come to the most crucial question—particularly crucial to myself personally.

I have been for some time past repeatedly asked whether I really have, after more than half a century of my own personal experience, such confidence in the honour and

good faith of British statesmen and Government as to expect that our just claims to self-government as British citizens will be willingly and gracefully accorded to us with every honest effort in their power, leaving alone and forgetting the past.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I shall give you a full and free answer.

In 1853, when I made my first little speech at the inauguration of the Bombay Association, in perfect innocence of heart influenced by my English education into great admiration for the character, instincts and struggles for liberty of the British people, I expressed my faith and confidence in the British Rulers in a short speech from which I give a short extract :

When we see that our Government is often ready to assist us in everything calculated to benefit us, we had better than merely complain and grumble, point out in a becoming manner what our real wants are.

And I also said :

If an association like this be always in readiness to ascertain by strict enquiries the probable good or bad effects of any proposed measure and, whenever necessary, to memorialise Government on behalf of the people with respect to them, our kind Government will not refuse to listen to such memorials.

Such was my faith. It was this faith of the educated of the time that made Sir Bartle Frere make the remark which Mr. Fawcett quoted, *viz*, that he had been much struck with the fact that the ablest exponents of English policy and our best coadjutors in adapting that policy to the wants of the various nations occupying Indian soil were to be found among the natives who had received a high-class English education. And now, owing to the non-fulfilment of solemn pledges, what a change has taken place in the mind of the educated !

Since my early efforts, I must say that I have felt so many disappointments as would be sufficient to break any heart and lead one to despair and even, I am afraid, to rebel.

My disappointments have not been of the ordinary kind but far worse and keener. Ordinarily a person fights—and if he fails he is disappointed. But I fought and won on several occasions, but the executive did not let us have the fruit of those victories—disappointments quite enough, as I have said, to break one's heart. For instance, the "Statutory" Civil Service, Simultaneous Examinations, Lord Lawrence Scholarships, Royal Commission, etc. I am thankful that the repayment from the Treasury of some unjust charges has been carried out, though the Indian Secretary's salary is not yet transferred to the Treasury as it was hoped.

But I have not despaired. Not only that I have not despaired, but at this moment, you may think it strange, I stand before you with hopefulness. I have not despaired for one reason—and I am hopeful for another reason.

I have not despaired under the influence of the good English word which has been the rule of my life. That word is "Persevere". In any movement, great or small, you must persevere to the end. You cannot stop at any stage, disappointments notwithstanding, or you lose all you have gained and find it far more difficult afterwards even to begin again. As we proceed, we may adopt such means as may be suitable at every stage, but persevere we must to the end. If our cause is good and just, as it is, we are sure to triumph in the end. So I have not despaired.

Now to the reason of my hopefulness which I feel at this moment after all my disappointments. And this also under the influence of one word "Revival"—the present "revival" of the true old spirit and instinct of liberty and free British institutions in the hearts of the leading statesmen of the day. I shall now place before you the declarations of some of the leading statesmen of the day and then you will judge that my faith and hope are well founded, whether they will be justified or not by future events.

Here, I give you a few of those declarations. But I give an Appendix A [of some of these declarations out of many.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN

We believe in self-government. We treat it not as an odious necessity, not as a foolish theory to which unfortunately the British Empire is committed. We treat it as a blessing and a healing, a sobering and a strengthening influence.—Bradford, 15-5-1901.

I remain as firm a believer as ever I was in the virtue of self-government.—Ayr, 29-10-1902.

But here is another—Self-government and popular control—and we believe in that principle.

MR. JOHN MORLEY

Yes, Gentlemen, the sacred word 'free' which represented, as Englishmen have always thought until to-day, the noblest aspirations that can animate the breast of man.—Palmerston Club, 9-6-1900.

In his view the root of good government was not to be found in bureaucracy or pedantocracy. They must seek to rouse up the free and spontaneous elements lying deep in the hearts and minds of the people of the country.—Arbroath, 23-10-1903.

The study of the present revival of the spirit, instincts and traditions of Liberty and Liberalism among the Liberal statesmen of the day has produced in my heart full expectation that the end of the evil system, and the dawn of a righteous and liberal policy of freedom and self-government are at hand for India. I trust that I am justified in my expectations and hopefulness.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we have all the powerful moral forces of justice, righteousness and honour of Britain, but our birthright and pledged rights and the absolute necessity and humanity of ending quickly all the sufferings of the masses of the people, from poverty, famine, plague, destitution and degradation, etc. On our side if we use those moral forces, which are very effective on a people like the British people, we must, we are bound to, win. What is wanted for us is to learn the lesson from Englishmen themselves—to agitate most largely and most perseveringly by petitions, demonstrations and meetings, all quite peacefully but enthusiastically conducted. Let us not throw away our rights and moral forces which are so overwhelming on our side. I shall say something again on this subject.

With such very hopeful and promising views and declarations of some of the leaders of the present Government, we have also coming to our side more and more Parliament, Press and Platform. We have some 200 Members in the Indian Parliamentary Committee. The Labour Members, the Irish Nationalist Members, and the Radicals are sympathetic with us. We have several Liberal papers such as "The Daily News", "The Tribune", "The Morning Leader", "The Manchester Guardian", "The Star", "The Daily Chronicle", "Justice", "Investors' Review", "Reynolds", "New Age", and several others taking a juster view of India's rights and needs. We must make "India" a powerful organ. We have all sections of the Labour or Democratic Party, the British Nationalist Party, the Radicals and Liberals generally taking larger interest in Indian matters. The large section of the British people, to whom conscience and righteousness are above every possible worldly thing, are also awakening to a sense of their duty to the vast population of India in their dire distress and poverty, with all its dreadful consequences. When I was in Parliament and the only Indian, I had the support of the Irish, Radical and Labour Members. I never felt helpless and alone, and I succeeded in several of my efforts. We must have many Indian Members in Parliament till we get self-government. Under such favourable circumstances let us not fail to make the most of our opportunity for our political emancipation. Let us, it is true, at the same time do, what is in our power, to advance our social and industrial progress. But for our political emancipation, it will be a great folly and misfortune for us to miss this good fortune when it has at last come to us, though I fully admit we had enough of disappointments to make us lose heart and confidence.

I base my hope upon the "revival" of the old British love of liberty and self-government, of honour for pledges, of our right of fellow British citizenship. Within the short life, that may yet be vouchsafed to me, I hope to see a loyal, honest, honourable and conscientious adoption

of the policy for self-government for India—and a beginning made at once towards that end.

I have not expressed to you my hopes and reasons for such hopes for ourselves. But as the Moral Law, the greatest force of the Universe, has it,—in our good will be England's own greatest good. Bright has wisely said :

The good of England must come through the channels of the good of India. . . . In order that England may become rich, India itself must become rich.

Mr. Morley has rightly said :

No, Gentlemen, every single right thing that is done by the Legislature, however moderate be its area, every single right thing is sure to lead to the doing of a great number of unforeseen right things—Dundee, 9-12-1889.

If India is allowed to be prosperous by self-government, as the Colonies have become prosperous by self-government, what a vista of glory and benefits open up for the citizens of the British Empire, and for mankind, as an example and proof of the supremacy of the moral law and true civilisation !

While we put the duty of leading us on to self-government on the heads of the present British statesmen, we have also the duty upon ourselves to do all we can to support those statesmen by, on the one hand, preparing our Indian people for the right understanding, exercise and enjoyment of self-government and, on the other hand, of convincing the British people that we justly claim and must have all British rights. I put before the Congress my suggestions for their consideration. To put the matter in right form, we should send our "Petition of Rights" to His Majesty the King-Emperor, to the House of Commons and to the House of Lords. By the British Bill of Rights of 1689—by the 5th Clause—"the subjects have the right to present petitions to the Sovereign".

The next thing I suggest for your consideration is that the well-to-do Indians should raise a large fund of patriotism. With this fund we should organise a body of able men and good speakers, to go to all the nooks and

corners of India and inform the people in their own languages of our British rights and how to exercise and enjoy them. Also to send to England another body of able speakers, and to provide means to go throughout the country and by large meetings to convince the British people that we justly claim and must have all British rights of self-government. By doing that I am sure that the British conscience will triumph and the British people will support the present statesmen in their work of giving India responsible self-government in the shortest possible period. We must have a great agitation in England, as well as here. The struggle against the Corn Laws cost, I think, two millions, and there was a great agitation. Let us learn to help ourselves in the same way.

I have said at the beginning that the duties of this Congress are twofold. And of the two, the claim to a change of the present policy leading to self-government is the chief and most important work.

The second part of the work is the vigilant watch over the inevitable and unnecessary defects of the present machinery of the Administration as it exists and as long as it exists. And as the fundamental principles of the present Administration are unsound, there are inherent evils and others are naturally ever arising from them. These the Congress has to watch and adopt means to remedy them, as far as possible, till self-government is attained, though it is only when self-government is attained that India will be free from its present evils and consequent sufferings. This part of the work, the Congress has been doing very largely during all the past twenty-one years, and the Subjects-Committee will place before you various resolutions necessary for the improvement of the existing administration, as far as such unnatural and uneconomic administration can be improved. I would not have troubled you more but that I should like to say a few words upon some topics connected with the second part of the work of the Congress—Bengal Partition and *Swadeshi* movement.

In the Bengal Partition, the Bengalees have a just and great grievance. It is a bad blunder for England. I do not despair, but that this blunder, I hope, may yet be rectified. This subject is being so well threshed out by the Bengalees themselves that I need not say anything more about it. But in connection with it we hear a great deal about agitators and agitation. Agitation is the life and soul of the whole political, social and industrial history of England. It is by agitation the English have accomplished their most glorious achievements, their prosperity, their liberties and, in short, their first place among the nations of the world.

The whole life of England, every day, is all agitation. You do not open your paper in the morning but read from beginning to end it is all agitation—Congresses and Conferences—Meetings and Resolutions—without end, for a thousand and one movements, local and national. From the Prime Minister to the humblest politician, his occupation is agitation for everything he wants to accomplish. The whole Parliament, Press and Platform is simply all agitation. Agitation is the civilised, peaceful weapon of moral force, and infinitely preferable to brute physical force when possible. The subject is very tempting. But I shall not say more than that the Indian journalists are mere Matriculates while the Anglo-Indian journalists are Masters of Arts in the University of British Agitators. The former are only the pupils of the latter, and the Anglo-Indian journalists ought to feel proud that their pupils are doing credit to them. Perhaps a few words from an English statesman will be more sedative and satisfactory.

Macaulay has said in one of his speeches :

I hold that we have owed to agitation a long series of beneficent reforms which would have been effected in no other way . . . the truth is that agitation is inseparable from popular government Would the slave-trade ever have been abolished without agitation? Would slavery ever have been abolished without agitation?

For every movement in England—hundreds, local and national—the chief weapons are agitation by meetings, demonstrations and petitions to Parliament. These petitions are not any begging for any favours any more than that the conventional “Your obedient servant” in letters makes a man an obedient servant. It is the conventional way of approaching higher authorities. The petitions are claims for rights or for justice or for reforms,—to influence and put pressure on Parliament by showing how the public regard any particular matter. The fact that we have more or less failed hitherto, is not because we have petitioned too much but that we have petitioned too little. One of the factors that carries weight in Parliament is the evidence that the people interested in any question are really in earnest. Only the other day, Mr. Asquith urged as one of his reasons against women’s franchise, that he did not see sufficient evidence to show that the majority of the women themselves were earnest to acquire the franchise. We have not petitioned or agitated enough at all in our demands. In every important matter we must petition Parliament with hundreds and thousands of petitions—with hundreds of thousands of signatures from all parts of India. Taking one present instance in England, the Church Party has held till the beginning of October last 1,400 meetings known and many more unknown against the Education Bill and petitioned with three-quarters of a million signatures and many demonstrations. Since then they have been possibly more and more active. Agitate, agitate over the whole length and breadth of India in every nook and corner—peacefully of course—if we really mean to get justice from John Bull. Satisfy him that we are in earnest. The Bengalees, I am glad, have learnt the lesson and have led the march. All India must learn the lesson—of sacrifice of money and of earnest personal work.

Agitate ; agitate means inform. Inform, inform the Indian people what their rights are, and why and how they should obtain them, and inform the British people of the rights of the Indian people and why they should grant

them. If we do not speak, they say we are satisfied. If we speak, we become agitators! The Indian people are properly asked to act constitutionally while the Government remains unconstitutional and despotic.

Next about the "settled fact". Every Bill defeated in Parliament is a "settled fact". Is it not? And the next year it makes its appearance again. The Education Act of 1902 was a settled fact. An act of Parliament, was it not? And now within a short time what a turmoil is it in? And what an agitation and excitement has been going on about it and is still in prospect? It may lead to a clash between the two Houses of Parliament. There is nothing as an eternal "settled fact". Times change, circumstances are misunderstood or changed, better light and understanding or new forces come into play, and what is settled to-day may become obsolete to-morrow.

The organizations which I suggest, and which I may call a band of political missionaries in all the Provinces, will serve many purposes at once—to inform the people of their rights as British citizens, to prepare them to claim those rights by petitions and when the rights are obtained to exercise and enjoy them.

Swadeshi is not a thing of to-day. It has existed in Bombay as far as I know for many years past. I am a free-trader, I am a member, and in the Executive Committee of the Cobden Club for 20 years, and yet I say *Swadeshi* is a forced necessity for India in its unnatural economic muddle. As long as the economic condition remains unnatural and impoverishing, by the necessity of supplying every year some Rs. 20,00,00,000 for the salary, pensions, etc., of the children of a foreign country at the expense and impoverishment of the children of India, to talk of applying economic laws to the condition of India is adding insult to injury. I have said so much about this over and over again that I would not say more about it here—I refer to my book. I ask any Englishman whether Englishmen would submit to this unnatural economic muddle of India for a single day in England, leave alone 150 years? No, never. No, Ladies and

Gentlemen, England will never submit to it. It is, what I have already quoted in Mr. Morley's words, it is "the meddling wrongly with economic things that is going to the very life, to the very heart, to the very core of our national existence".

Among the duties which I have said are incumbent upon the Indians, there is one, which, though I mention last, is not the least. I mean a thorough political union among the Indian people of all creeds and classes. I make an appeal to all—call it mendicant if you like—I am not ashamed of being a mendicant in any good cause and under necessity for any good cause. I appeal to the Indian people for this, because it is in their own hands only just as I appeal to the British people for things that are entirely in their hands. In this appeal for a thorough union for political purposes among all the people I make a particular one to my friends, the Mahomedans. They are a manly people. They have been rulers both in and out of India. They are rulers this day both in and out of India. They have the highest Indian Prince ruling over the largest State, *viz.*, H. H. the Nizam. Among other Mahomedan Princes they have Junagad, Radhanpur, Bhopal and others.

Notwithstanding their backward education, they have the pride of having had in all India the first Indian Barrister in Mr. Badrudin Tyabji and the first Solicitor in Mr. Kamrudin Tyabji, two Mahomedan brothers.* What a

* As regards the first Indian Barrister and the first Indian Attorney, it appears that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was wrongly informed. Of course, any community would be proud of two such distinguished members as were the Tyabji brothers, both of whom met with great success and attained the highest positions in their respective professions, but they were not the first Indians to adopt those professions. Mr. Budrudin Tyabji was called to the Bar on the 30th April, 1867, and there were at least two or three Indian Barristers before him. Mr. M. Ghose was called on the 6th June, 1866, and Mr. G. M. Tagore, who is believed to be first Indian Barrister, was called to the Bar on the 11th June, 1862, and long before that, Babu Baney Madhub Banerjee became an Attorney of the Calcutta High Court, and he was believed to have been the first Indian Attorney, whereas Mr. Kamrudin Tyabji was a contemporary of his other brother.

large share of Bombay commerce is in the hands of Mahomedans is well known. Their chief purpose and effort at present must be to spread education among themselves. In this matter among their best friends have been Sir Syed Ahmed and Justice Tyabji in doing their utmost to promote education among them. Once they bring themselves in education in a line with the Hindus, they have nothing to fear. They have in them the capacity, energy, and intellect, to hold their own and to get their due share in all the walks of life—of which the State Services are but a small part. State Services are not everything.

Whatever voice I can have, I wish Government would give every possible help to promote education among the Mahomedans. Once self-government is attained, then will there be prosperity enough for all, but not till then. The thorough union, therefore, of all the people for their emancipation is an absolute necessity.

All the people in their political position are in one boat. They must sink or swim together. Without this union, all efforts will be vain. There is the common saying—but also the best common sense—"United we stand—divided we fall".

There is one other circumstance I may mention here. If I am right, I am under the impression that the bulk of the Bengalee Mahomedans were Hindus by race and blood only a few generations ago. They have the tie of blood and kinship. Even now a great mass of the Bengalee Mahomedans are not to be easily distinguished from their Hindu brothers. In many places they join together in their social joys and sorrows. They cannot divest themselves from the natural affinity of common blood. On the Bombay side, the Hindus and Mahomedans of Gujarat all speak the same language—Gujarati, and are of the same stock, and all the Hindus and Mahomedans of Maharashtric Annan; all speak the same language—Marathi and are of the same stock; and so I think it is all over India, excepting in North India where there are the descendants of the original Mahomedan invaders, but they are now also the people of India.

Sir Syed Ahmed was a nationalist to the backbone. I will mention an incident that happened to myself with him. On his first visit to England, we happened to meet together in the house of Sir C. Wingfield. He and his friends were waiting, and I was shown into the same room. One of his friends recognising me introduced me to him. As soon as he heard my name, he at once held me in strong embrace and expressed himself very much pleased. In various ways, I knew that his heart was in the welfare of all India as one nation. He was a large and liberal-minded patriot. When I read his life some time ago, I was inspired with respect and admiration for him. As I cannot find my copy of his life, I take the opportunity of repeating some of his utterances which Sir Henry Cotton has given in *India* of 12th October last :

Mahomedans and Hindus were, he said, the two eyes of India, injure the one and you injure the other. We should try to become one in heart and soul and act in unison ; if united, we can support each other, if not, the effect of one against the other will tend to the destruction and downfall of both.

He appreciated when he found worth and freely expressed it. He said :

I assure you that the Bengalees are the only people in our country whom we can properly be proud of, and it is only due to them that knowledge, liberty and patriotism have progressed in our country. I can truly say that they are really the head and crown of all the communities of Hindustan. In the word "nation" I include both Hindus and Mahomedans, because that is the only meaning which I can attach to it.

Such was the wise and patriotic counsel of that great man, and our Mahomedan friends will, I hope, take it to heart. I repeat once more that our emancipation depends upon the thorough union of all the people of India without any obstruction.

I have often read about the question of a constitution for the Congress. I think the gentlemen who raise this question would be the proper persons to prepare one like a Bill in the House of Commons in all its details. The Congress then can consider it and deal with it as the majority may decide.

Let every one of us do the best he can, do all in harmony for the common object of self-government.'

Lastly, the question of social reforms and industrial progress—each of them needs its own earnest body of workers. Each requires for it separate, devoted attention. All the three great purposes—Political, Social and Industrial—must be set working side by side. The progress in each will have its influence on the others. But, as Mr. Morley truly and with deep insight says: "Political principles are, after all, the root of our national greatness, strength and hope," and his other important utterance which I repeat with this one sums up the whole position of the Indian problem. He says: "The meddling wrongly with economic things, that is going to the very life, to the very heart, to the very core of our national existence."

This meddling wrongly with economic things is the whole evil from which India suffers—and the only remedy for it is—"Political principles are, after all, the root of our national greatness, strength and hope." And these political principles are summed up in self-government. Self-government is the only and chief remedy. In self-government lies our hope, strength and greatness.

I recommend to your serious notice the treatment of British Indians in South Africa.

Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have finished my task. I do not know what good fortune may be in store for me during the short period that may be left to me, and if I can leave a word of affection and devotion for my country and countrymen, I say, be united, persevere and achieve self-government, so that the millions now perishing by poverty, famine and plague, and the scores of millions that are starving on scanty subsistence may be saved, and India may once more occupy her proud position of yore among the greatest and civilized nations of the world.

Twenty-third Congress—Surat—1907

HON. DR. RASH BEHARI GHOSE, C.I.E.

INTRODUCTION

BROTHER-DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—My first duty is to tender you my thanks for the signal honour you have done me in asking me to take the chair. Believe me, I am more than grateful for the distinction you have conferred on me, unsought and unsolicited—a proud distinction, the proudest in your power to confer, but a distinction which carries with it a very heavy responsibility. For the position which I am occupying so unworthily is full of anxiety and was never more so than at the present juncture when heavy clouds have floated into the political sky; and in standing before you to-day I feel as if I was summoned to drive the chariot of the Sun; and if I am spared the fate of Phæton, I shall owe my good fortune only to your forbearance and indulgent kindness on which I am confident I can safely rely. I can rely, too, with confidence on your willing co-operation; for are we not all animated by one common purpose and do we not know that co-operation is the very life of concerted action which can never thrive in an atmosphere of continuous strife and difference?

PRESENT SITUATION

Every one must admit that we are passing through a sad and eventful period—a period of stress and storm

N.B.—The above address was delivered in part at the Indian National Congress, Surat, 1907.

—and if ever there was a time when we ought to close up our ranks and present a firm, serried and united front that time is this; for the situation is of more than ordinary gravity. It is full of difficulty and full of peril and unless we are imbued with a strong sense of discipline and of responsibility, the vessel of the Congress may be steered direct upon the rocks. It would be idle to deny, and I do not deny, that domestic dissensions have raised angry storms which are now sweeping across some parts of the country; but there is no real occasion for pessimism or despair, though the incidents which recently occurred at Nagpur might well fill some minds with misgivings. There is, however, every reason to think that these disturbances were mainly the work of some misguided young men who had been carried off their feet by the wild talk of irresponsible persons. Of one thing, however, I am certain; those who have compelled us to change our place of meeting have no right to be proud of their achievement.

GREATNESS OF SURAT

And here, on behalf of the assembled delegates, I must gratefully acknowledge the readiness and alacrity with which the people of Surat invited us to hold our sittings in their historic city. In offering their hospitality to the Congress they have only acted in accordance with their traditional generosity; for they are citizens of no mean city. Surat, as history tells us, was the queen of Western India, a busy and famous mart before the lake village of Llyndyn was staked out, and long, long before Venice rose from the sea. But, perhaps, her greatest distinction, it is certainly her best title to our gratitude, is that Surat was the first resting place on Indian soil—where dissent was never suppressed by the sword, the gibbet or the stake—of the Parsi pilgrim fathers who cheerfully left home and kindred for the sake of conscience and whose descendants have inherited the virtues with the blood of their ancestors and repaid their debt a thousand-fold to India; for I make bold to say that there is no community whose love for the country is greater than that

to which so many of our leaders belong, and which has given to us our "Grand Old Man".

LATE BABU KALI CHARAN BANERJEE

I am glad to see in this assembly almost all our prominent leaders—men whose names are as household words and who have already taken an abiding place in the minds of the people. But I miss some well known faces. Kali Charan Banerjee is no longer amongst us. A pious Christian, an accomplished scholar, an eloquent speaker and an ardent patriot, he was an ideal leader respected by every community in the country. A most strenuous and earnest worker, his whole heart was in the Congress and his love for it was strong even in death. For who does not remember how he left a sick bed to attend our last meeting in Calcutta? Who does not remember how, though overcome by the heat and warned by the doctors, he refused to leave the assembly till he fell into a swoon and had to be carried out of the pandal? He died only a few days afterwards and when we think of the lonely Scotch cemetery in Koraya, where his remains were laid, we cannot help feeling how much learning, how much modest and unassuming simplicity, how much piety, how much winsome tenderness and how much patriotism lie buried in the grave of Kali Charan Banerjee. That hand which everybody was glad to touch is vanished. That voice which everybody was glad to hear is still. But if to live in the hearts and memories of those whom we leave behind is not to die, Kali Charan is not dead but is still alive. True, he no longer lives in his own person but he lives in us and will live on in those who succeed us, enjoying an immortality which is not given to all the sons of men.

LATE PANDIT BISWAMBHARNATH

Pandit Biswambharnath, too, of Allahabad, has been gathered to his fathers, and we shall miss his mellow patriarchal wisdom in our councils. But though his work on earth has been done, in that high sense of duty which alone could have nerved him when, as President of the

Reception Committee in 1892, he welcomed the delegates to Allahabad, though only three weeks before a paralytic seizure had brought him to the verge of the grave, he has left an example which will continue to inspire generations of his countrymen. The Pandit was in many ways a most remarkable man, and it will be long before there arises among us another jurist, scholar and patriot who can make us forget the loss of Biswambharnath.

THE RECENT DEPORTATIONS

Gentlemen, the year that is now fast drawing to a close has seen the country convulsed to its depths and has truly been a dramatic year. The first Act opened with the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai and of Ajit Singh. This was followed by the Ordinance against public meetings, the Rawalpindi trial, and the Press prosecutions in the Punjab and in Bengal, and the curtain dropped on what, it is to be hoped, was the last scene in the Council Chamber at Simla, when the Public Meetings Act was passed.

It has been said in defence of the resurrection of Regulation III of 1818, that it is a standing law. It is not a standing law but a standing negation of all law; not a standing law, but a standing menace to our liberty, a standing reproach in our Statute-Book. A prosecution, we have been gravely told, attracts public attention and a trial for sedition is, therefore, not always desirable. This is the good old rule, the simple plan, which used to be followed in an ancient Scotch border town which also possessed a standing law, though even in Jedburgh the formality of a trial was not wholly dispensed with, only it took place after the execution. It may be a mere weakness in a lawyer; but I confess I cannot congratulate the Indian Government on their use of a weapon which is as obsolete in civilised jurisprudence as the rack or the screw. Their action in deporting a man for reasons which they dared not disclose was "illegal," unconstitutional," "tyrannical," arbitrary," "impudently absurd" and "preposterous." None of these epithets are mine. They

have all been taken by me from Hansard and were used by a staunch Liberal on a memorable occasion. And was not Mr. Morley's answer in the House of Commons the most outrageous and indefensible answer ever given since Simon de Montfort invented Parliament? But it seems that what is true under one degree of longitude is not true under another. What is true in Cape Town is not true in the Punjab.

Who but must laugh, if such a man there be,
Who would not weep if Morlieus were he?

And who was the first victim selected for the exercise of this arbitrary power? An earnest, religious and social reformer, a man whose character was above all reproach, a man who lived not for himself but for others—the idol of the Punjab. Such a man is suddenly discovered by the secret police to be a revolutionary and political enthusiast animated by an insane hatred of the British Government and secretly plotting its forcible subversion. If Lala Lajpat Rai had been put on his trial, he could have triumphantly vindicated his innocence and shown that even strong Lieutenant-Governors are not infallible. He could have triumphantly shown that the garbled extracts in the *Wafadar* gave a most untruthful version of his speech. He could have triumphantly shown that all his aims and methods have been strictly constitutional and that he had always set his face against agitation which tended to sedition or disorder. But this privilege, which may be claimed by the meanest criminal, was denied to one of our foremost men; and if Lala Lajpat Rai is now regarded as a martyr by his countrymen generally, it is the Government and the Government alone that have elevated him to that position and placed that priceless crown of thorns upon his head. If the Fort of Mandalay is now regarded as a holy place, as I know it is by some of my countrymen, it is the Government and the Government alone that have invested it with that holiness.

THE RAWALPINDI CASE

In Etawah, too, a similar tragedy would have taken place had it not been averted by the good sense of

Sir John Hewett, who was able to see through the disgraceful conspiracy which had been so cunningly planned. But the spectre of an impending Mutiny had obscured the vision of the Punjab officials, and they saw in a mob riot a deep-laid scheme for the overthrow of the British Rule. The result was the Rawalpindi prosecution which has thrown a lurid light on the methods of sedition hunters. Men occupying the highest position in society and looked up to as their leaders by the people in the Punjab were placed in the dock as felons, who had by their seditious speeches incited violent riots. For six long months these men were detained in prison, as bail was refused on the ground that they could not, with safety to the State, be allowed to be at large. But what was the end of this prosecution? A complete vindication of their innocence and a most scathing exposure of the case for the Crown. The judgment of the Special Magistrate shows that panic had magnified into rebellion a perfectly lawful agitation against very substantial grievances. The evidence on which the six lawyers had been kept in prison for months was "suspicious if not fabricated", and there was not the shadow of a shade of evidence to establish any sort of complicity on their part with any conspiracy against the British Crown.

And this leads me to remark that the situation in the Punjab was succinctly summed up by Lala Lajpat Rai in a letter which was written by him only a few hours before his arrest. The discontent, he said, was due to several causes which he set forth in chronological order :

(a) The letters and articles that appeared in the *Civil and Military Gazette* some time in July and August last year under the heading "Signs of the Times".

(b) The prosecution of the *Panjabee* coupled with the refusal of the Government to take similar action against the *Civil and Military Gazette*.

(c) The Colonisation Bill.

(d) The Land Alienation Act Amendment Bill.

(e) The increase of the Canal rates on the Bari-Doab Canal.

(f) The abnormal increase of Land Revenue in the Rawalpindi District.

(g) The appalling mortality from plague which had made the people sullen and labour scarce, and raised the wages abnormally.

This diagnosis was perfectly correct; for as soon as the most pressing grievances were removed, the Punjab became quiet, though the bureaucracy will probably persuade themselves that this happy result was entirely due to the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai and of Ajit Singh, and that another Mutiny had been averted solely by their foresight and timely precautions.

PRESS PROSECUTIONS

The Press prosecutions, too, which were entered upon so lightly by the Government, did not show much wisdom. In some instances the Crown failed to secure a conviction, and a defeat in such cases must always cover the Government with humiliation. Then, again, the prosecutions in Calcutta showed unmistakably the new spirit with which the people are prepared to face all attempts at coercion. In many of these cases the defendants refused to plead and cheerfully went to prison, and they must be blind indeed who cannot see in it a new consciousness of nationality, which at the present day inspires Young India and has penetrated even the seclusion of the zenana. When the Editor of the *Yugantar* was sent to jail, there was a crowded meeting of Indian ladies in Calcutta not to condole but to present a congratulatory address to his mother, and what did the old lady say in her reply? "Bepin's useful career has just begun," she said, "with his recent incarceration and his example will do more good than his mere presence as a humble worker in the midst of his countrymen." Again, at the Barisal Conference, which was forcibly dispersed, some ladies flung away their ornaments on witnessing the humiliation of their husbands and sons and took a vow to forego all luxuries, till the men had learnt to assert

their lawful rights. Not satisfied with these prosecutions, the Government undertook a crusade against mere school-boys, and our young barbarians were either publicly flogged or condemned to hard labour. Is it a matter for wonder that all this should have called for the most intense indignation throughout the country? The official may not believe it, but we can assure him the Indian has eyes and hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, and passions.

Is it a matter for wonder that the political movements should have waxed stronger and stronger, driving even many moderate men into active sympathy with those whom they had previously regarded as impracticable visionaries?

UNREST IN BENGAL

And this brings me to the unrest in Bengal, the partition of which has not only strained the loyalty of many people but has led to tragic results, which ought to have been foreseen by the author of that measure. One of its objects was to strengthen the Mahomedan influence in East Bengal. The influence has been strengthened; but its strength has been manifested in a peculiar way. I do not wish to dwell on the Mahomedan riots and the atrocities which occurred in East Bengal, but this I am bound to say, that the local officials were lacking in that firmness and impartiality which are the best title of England to our allegiance. I wish to speak with moderation, but what are we to think when a Sessions Judge divides witnesses into two classes, Hindus and Mahomedans, and prefers the evidence of Mahomedans to Hindus, because they are Mahomedans. This avowed bias has naturally alienated Hindus who are burning with resentment.

DIVIDE AND RULE POLICY

Every one familiar with the recent history of Macedonia—and our officials are certainly familiar with it—knows that it is very difficult for a country to obtain autonomy when it is torn by religious and racial hatreds. To divide and rule, however, is a maxim which must be

hateful to every Englishman, and we should be sorry to charge any English official with such tactics. But the fact remains that, for the first time in Bengal, racial and religious hatreds have been surging in the new Province among communities who formerly lived on the most friendly terms. Lord Curzon, I find, protests against the notion that he meant to play off the Mahomedans against the Hindus, and we are bound to accept His Lordship's denial; but there is a well known maxim in law that every man must be presumed to foresee the consequence of his own acts; though in the case of His Lordship with his well known foibles, we are not driven to rely upon this old legal saw.

The officials still fondly believe or pretend to believe that the Mahomedans were goaded to madness by the boycott movement of the Hindus! and that this was the real cause of the general lawlessness of the lower classes among the Mahomedans which burst into flame in East Bengal only a few months ago. It is, however, singular that this lawlessness did not reveal itself when the movement was at its height. Again, if the official view is correct, we have a remarkable instance of the innate perversity of the Oriental mind; for the boycott benefited the Mahomedans and not the Hindus, by reviving the weaving industry on which they had lived for generations. It is, however, unnecessary to discuss this question at length, because it has now been placed beyond all controversy by the solemn judgments pronounced not by Hindu but by English and Mahomedan Magistrates.

At Jamalpur, where the disturbances began in the Mymensingh District, the first information lodged at the Police Station contained no reference whatever to boycott or picketting. Mr. Beatson Bell, the trying Magistrate at Dewanganj, observed that boycott was not the cause of the disturbances. Another Special Magistrate at Dewanganj, himself a Mahomedan gentleman of culture, remarked:

There was not the least provocation for rioting; the common object of the rioters was evidently to molest the Hindus.

In another case the same Magistrate observed:

The evidence adduced on the side of the prosecution shows that on the date of the riots, the accused had read over a notice to a crowd of Mussalmans and had told them that the Government and the Nawab Bahadur of Dacca had passed orders to the effect that nobody would be punished for plundering and oppressing the Hindus. So, after the Kal's image was broken by the Mussalmans the shops of the Hindu traders were also plundered.

Again, Mr. Barniville, the Sub-Divisional Officer of Jamalpur, in his Report on the Melandahat riot, said ;

Some Mussalmans proclaimed by beat of drum that the Government had permitted them to loot the Hindus.

And in the Hargilchar abduction case the same Magistrate remarked that the outrages were due to the announcement that the Government had permitted the Mahomedans to marry Hindu widows in *nikka* form.

The true explanation of the savage outbreak is to be found in the "red pamphlet" which was circulated so widely among the Mahomedans in East Bengal, and in which there is not a word about boycott or Hindu volunteers. "Ye Mussalmans," said the red pamphlet, "arise, awake, do not read in the same school with Hindus. Do not buy anything from a Hindu shop. Do not touch any article manufactured by Hindu hands. Do not give any employment to a Hindu. Do not accept any degrading office under a Hindu. You are ignorant, but if you acquire knowledge, you can at once send all Hindus to *Jehannum* (hell). You form the majority of the population of this Province. Among the cultivators also you form the majority. It is agriculture that is the source of wealth. The Hindu has no wealth of his own and has made himself rich only by despoiling you of your wealth. If you become sufficiently enlightened, then the Hindus will starve and soon become Mahomedans." The man who preached this *Jihad* was only bound down to keep the peace for one year! You are probably surprised at such leniency. We in Bengal were not, or were only, surprised to hear that man had been bound down at all!

At the present moment there is undoubtedly a lull in East Bengal; but who knows that the Province may not

be swept again by another violent storm of wild frenzy and brute ferocity? For the devil of religious jealousy and hatred may be easily evoked; it cannot be as easily dismissed.

THE SEDITIOUS MEETINGS ACT

The partition of Bengal is at the root of all these disorders and the discontent created by it has spread to other parts of the country. The result is a general unrest, and in the opinion of the Government, the situation is becoming serious. But is not the solution of the problem within easy reach? You cannot govern India without the sympathy and confidence of the people. That sympathy and that confidence have been imperilled by Lord Curzon's autocratic measure and the only way to win back our sympathy and confidence is its reversal and not the Seditious Meetings Act which was passed on the 1st November last. Of that Act I find it difficult to speak with patience. But, as my honourable friend Mr. Gokhale said in the Council Chamber, even more dangerous than the Act itself is the policy that lies behind it—a policy which is unwise in the highest degree and which is bound to fail in India as it has failed everywhere else. It will burn into the minds of the people harsh memories which even time may be powerless to efface, and will, there is every reason to fear, enhance the very evil which it is intended to control.

We hope, however, that this new weapon with which the Executive have been armed, will be very sparingly used. For the Prime Minister said only a few days ago that he was in favour of the free toleration of all agitation that is not directly and openly subversive of order. And I have no doubt that these principles of toleration will be loyally carried out by the Indian Government, when they recover from the panic which has seized them. All agitation is not subversive of order. Every agitator is not a rebel though he is labelled as such by a section of the Anglo-Indian Press. A speech may be objectionable in expression and temper, but it ought not to be repressed merely because it might indirectly be subversive of order.

LORD CURZON

By a strange irony of fate, it was left to a sympathetic Viceroy and a Liberal Secretary of State to adopt a policy of repression which Lord Curzon never ceases to remind us he had no occasion to call in aid. But the responsibility for this new policy primarily rests upon His Lordship, not upon Mr. Morley or Lord Minto who did not come into a "haven of peace". Heavy storms had broken out before the retirement of Lord Curzon, who left undone everything which he ought to have done. People for the first time began to distrust the good faith of their rulers, for His Lordship made no secret of his conviction that England's true mission was to govern India, but not through the people or with their assistance. The commercial exploitation of the country and its administration by Englishmen were his ideal of imperialism. Indians were to be excluded from all offices of trust and responsibility and were to be denied even all opportunities of qualifying themselves for such offices, which were to be reserved exclusively for the ruling race. And in every department of the public service a large number of highly paid officers were created by him to be filled by his own countrymen.

LORD CURZON AND THE NEW PARTY

We have, Gentlemen, a long and heavy indictment to bring against Lord Curzon. We charge him with having arrested the progress of education. We charge him with having set back the dial of local self-government. We charge him with having deliberately sacrificed the interests of the Indian people in order to conciliate English exploiters and administrators. And, lastly, we charge him with having set Bengal in a blaze. It is Lord Curzon and Lord Curzon alone who is responsible for the rise of the new party; for he drove the people to despair and to madness. It is true Lord Curzon has retired, and yet the new party is growing in numbers. But we maintain, that Lord Curzon is responsible for this growth, and if it is also growing in bitterness, Lord Curzon and Lord Curzon alone is responsible for it. Mr. Morley speaks of his duty

to arrest the hand which would set the prairie on fire. Why did he not then, though in opposition, seek to arrest Lord Curzon's hand? He could not have rendered a greater service both to England and to India; for no Englishman has done more to undermine our loyalty than the Viceroy who sought to humiliate not only His Majesty's Indian subjects but also the great ruling chiefs. It is quite possible we have failed to appreciate His Lordship's good intentions, but the herald who recorded only the other day the virtues of Lord Clive may console himself with the reflection that justice may yet be done to him in the avenging pages of history—in the Greek Kalends.

PARTITION OF BENGAL—A FESTERING SORE

If the Punjab is quiet, it is only because the grievances of the people have been redressed. If Bengal is still in a disturbed condition, it is only because the partition of Bengal is a festering sore which will not be healed. Let the Bengali speaking people be placed under a Governor with an Executive Council, and you will see the winter of our discontent made glorious summer. Force is no remedy, and the best security for the peace of the country is the conviction that all real grievances will be redressed; not deportations or coercion Acts; and I have no hesitation in saying that timely concessions alone can arrest the progress of the discontent which, though at present is a cloud, no bigger than a man's hand, may in time overshadow the whole land.

MR. MORLEY

And this reminds me that Mr. Morley made a fatal mistake, fatal to his reputation as a Liberal and a statesman, when he refused to undo the partition of Bengal and sought shelter behind a settled fact. If he had only shown more courage, Bengal would not have been convulsed and there would have been no excuse for the reactionary policy which has done so much to tarnish his fair fame as a Liberal statesman. And yet though unwilling to disturb the partition of Bengal, in his first Budget speech, Mr.

Morley spoke sympathetically of the new spirit which is abroad in India. The Indian system of government could, not, he admitted, move in the old narrow groove but called for improvement. Speaking of the Indian Congress, he said that there was no reason to be frightened at its demands, as it did not insist on any violent or startling new departures. Dissatisfaction with the administration, said the great disciple of Mill, is not disaffection. It is true he did not think that India should have universal suffrage or be placed on the same footing as the self-governing colonies, but he insisted upon the spirit, the temper, the principles and the maxims of English institutions being applied to the Government of India. Mr. Morley also said that a definite and deliberate move ought to be made with a view of giving competent and able Indians the same access to the higher posts in the administration that are given to their British fellow-subjects, and pointed out that the Proclamation of Queen Victoria should be construed in a liberal and generous sense and not refined away with the ingenuity of a quibbling Attorney's clerk.

We should be untrue, said the friend and biographer of Gladstone, to all the traditions of this Parliament and to those who, from time to time and from generation to generation, have been the leaders of the Liberal Party, if we were to show ourselves afraid of facing and recognising the new spirit with candour and consideration.

We know how these professions have ended in deportations, ordinances, public prosecutions, punitive police, military constabulary and the Public Meetings Act.

UNREST IN THE PUNJAB

On the last Budget debate, this great Liberal Minister boldly said that he has no apology whatever to offer for the deportations in the Punjab, and he recommended a policy of firmness which in India means repression. Now we are quite willing to believe in Mr. Morley's kindness, sympathy and love of justice, though it may cost us a painful mental effort, but when he says his anchor still holds, we are bound to remind him that his vessel has veered

round with the tide. He will not probably admit that he has changed his ground, but he has certainly changed his front. It is not, however, at all difficult to account for this sad change in Mr. Morley's attitude. He has been evidently misled by his responsible advisers whose knowledge of the condition of the country is derived from secret police reports, and who told him of widespread sedition and the imminence not of a mere mutiny but of a revolt against the English rule with all its attendant horrors,—a rising of the women and children against the men. A large section of the English Press also sought to create enmity between the two races by stirring up the memory of the dark days of the Indian Mutiny, stained with so many crimes and so much carnage; and the *London Times*, true to its traditions, recounted the old story with embellishments in order to embitter our rulers against us. What wonder, then, if that apostle of freedom to whom reasons of State are only the tyrant's plea, has been compelled to yield to the pressure put upon him by responsible advisers and by the Press. I will not say, with the Tory Press in England, that Mr. Morley has been translated, but we are painfully reminded of Ariel in the hateful bondage of Sycorax. The truth is politics, even in our day, is like pitch. You cannot touch it without being defiled, and the Secretary of State might have profited by the warning of Comte that a philosopher who holds up from his closet lofty ideals of conduct should not take an active part in the practical administration of a country like India where a Liberal statesman must frequently stoop to arts which may be reconciled to the official conscience but not to the conscience of the plain man.

Mr. Morley, I repeat, has fallen under the spell of the bureaucracy. We are quite willing to believe he means well. Indeed, the India Office, like the floor of the House of Commons, is paved with good intentions. But under the present system of administration, it is impossible for any single man to do any real service to us. The Secretary of State has to take his facts from the Indian officials, and the only public opinion of which he knows

anything is not the public opinion in India, but the public opinion in England, nourished upon the lies told by unscrupulous correspondents which are faithfully reproduced in the English Press.

THE GROWTH OF A NEW PARTY

The growth of a new party in India has also served as a very useful excuse for delaying all reforms. I am, however, bound to say that this party is not, at the present moment, at all dangerous. Every sensible man disapproves of its methods; if the Government can only rally the Moderates to their side by gradually preparing the country to take its position as a self-governing State or a federation of States united together under the supreme authority of England, they will extinguish the new party completely, and the ominous shadow which has projected itself over the future fortunes of the country will disappear. The bureaucracy, however, is unable to distinguish, or refuses to distinguish, between those who earnestly seek for reform and the irresponsible agitators who would have nothing to do with the Government. They are all tarred with the same brush. Those who demand a larger share in the administration of their country, as essential to the welfare and the stability of the British Government, are confounded with the pestilent demagogue who would drive the hated foreigner into the sea. Those who counsel their countrymen to have patience, confident that their rulers would in time give them all they can reasonably want, if they confine their agitation to constitutional methods, are confounded with those who assert that nothing good can come out of England, and that passive resistance, if persisted in, would compel the English to retire from the country. But is it not a serious blunder, which in politics we all know is worse than a crime, to denounce the whole of the educated classes as disloyal? Such denunciations have sometimes a fatal tendency to realise themselves.

WHO ARE THE ENEMIES OF ENGLAND?

Mr. Morley recently spoke of the "enemies of England", but who are these enemies? Not certainly the

educated classes who represent the better mind of India. The real enemies of England are those Englishmen who lose no opportunity of showing their hatred and contempt for the people of this country. Flushed with the insolence of a ruling caste they treat them as an inferior race with whom friendly or sympathetic relations are impossible.

The danger of such an attitude was clearly discerned by Lord Salisbury, who, when he was Secretary of State for India, addressed this memorable warning to the Cooper's Hill College students more than thirty years ago :

No system of government, he said, can be permanently safe where there is a feeling of inferiority or of mortification affecting the relations between the governing and the governed. There is nothing I would more earnestly wish to impress upon all who leave this country for the purpose of governing India than that, if they choose to be so, they are the only enemies England has to fear. They are the persons who can, if they will, deal a blow of the deadliest character at the future rule of England.

Since this warning was given, the relations between the two classes have grown worse and have given rise to racial hatred which is sure to cause serious trouble ; for, as Mr. Morley said only the other day, bad and overbearing manners in India are a political crime.

The real enemies of England are those who talk of the lofty duty of England towards India but believe or pretend to believe, that this can only be discharged by a foreign bureaucracy and that, in the interest of the people themselves, they ought not to have any real share in the administration of the country. For, as Mr. Morley, the most tender, lofty, cheerful and delicately sober of all moralists says, "the usual excuse of those who do evil to other people is that their object is to do them good".

The real enemies of England are those who try to stir up racial hatred in the Press by the most unblushing lies whenever reform is in the air. I am afraid to trust myself to speak of the conduct of these men who are a standing menace to British Rule, and will only say that we deeply regret that at this critical period the Government of India should have selected a correspondent of the

Daily Mail, to supply them with Indian news at an extravagant salary. Who does not know the achievements of that paper in all parts of the world—in Africa, in China, and in India! Who does not remember the story of the "coronation" of Babu Surendranath Bannerji, of the reign of terror established in Eastern Bengal by the "National Volunteers", the "Barisal Scare", the incipient mutiny and last, though not least, the treasonable incitements of Mr. Keir Hardie? This is certainly not the way to restore the confidence of the people who are overcome by a sense of utter helplessness and despair.

CONGRESS DEMANDS

Mr. Morley said in his last speech that he could not discover what we want our Rulers to do which they are not slowly and gradually taking steps to accomplish, and seems to think that we were crying for the moon. But the National Congress does not surely cry for the moon when it asks for the reduction of the military expenditure. The National Congress does not surely cry for the moon when it protests against degrading Colonial Ordinances and demands for the Indian the ordinary rights of British citizenship in the Colonies. The National Congress does not surely cry for the moon when it seeks the separation of Judicial from Executive functions or protests against the partition of Bengal. The National Congress does not surely cry for the moon when it insists upon the extension of primary education or the limitation of the revenue on lands which belong to the State. The National Congress does not surely cry for the moon when it insists upon a truly effective representation of the people in the Legislative Councils or upon their representation in the Executive Councils of the Viceroy and of the Governors of Madras and of Bombay.

We do not demand the immediate recall of Lord Kitchener or the disbandment of the Indian army. We do not demand universal suffrage. And yet these were some of the red herrings Mr. Morley dragged across the path of English public opinion in his Arbroath speech. What we do demand is that our Rulers should introduce

reform as steps towards giving us that self-government which is now the aspiration of a people educated for three generations in the political ideas of the West. Mr. Morley admits that the English are here not for their own interest but for the interest of the millions committed to their charge. Now, though this assertion has an unctuous theological flavour about it, and must be taken with a few grains of Kurcutch salt, I take it no Englishman will deny that the supremacy of the English is not to last for ever and that their real object is to teach India to rule herself. I am confident that every true Englishman who has an inborn sense of freedom and justice has faith in self-government. And I can affirm with equal confidence that, however beneficent a foreign rule may be, no people in whom all manhood has not been killed out will ever willingly submit for ever to the yoke though it may be wreathed with flowers. This is a natural sentiment which must commend itself to every true-hearted Englishman. The "brightest jewel in the British Crown" must not be regarded merely as a market for British goods or a field for the safe investment of British capital or as an opening a dignified career to "our boys". Now, can any one honestly say that England has done all that she might have done towards accomplishing her mission? What, I ask our Rulers, have you done during the one-and-half centuries of your stewardship? Given increased material prosperity? Granted; though the people with Oriental perversity still continue to die of famine. Given us high education? Granted; though here again in ways peculiar to the East where the law of cause and effect does not hold good that education has, according to you, led not to contentment but to disaffection. But if that education, as we assert, has with all its faults given you public servants as able and as loyal as their English brethren, has not the time come to give the educated classes a larger share in the administration of the country? We look at the achievements of Japan in less than fifty years. We look at Persia, we look at China, and our minds are filled with despair. We cannot any longer be fed with worn out platitudes; and when Mr. Morley deals in them, he forgets

that we too may claim to have kindled our modest rush-lights at Burke and Mill's benignant lamps. We too know the painful journey that lies before us before we can be welded into the political unity of a nation. Long, long is the way, rugged is the ground and the weary steps must be trodden with bleeding feet, with bleeding knees and with bleeding hearts. But do not, we pray you, stand with a drawn sword to impede our journey.

I repeat that we are not crying for the moon. I repeat, that all we ask is that our country should take her rightful place among the nations under the ægis of England. We want in reality and not in mere name to be the sons of the Empire. Our ambition is to draw closer to England and to be absorbed in that Greater Britain in which we have now no place. The ideal after which we are striving is autonomy within the Empire, and not absolute independence. Let England help us in attaining our object and her name will continue to shine with undimmed glory, even when the New Zealander sits on the ruined arches of Westminster Bridge.

NEW SPIRIT

A new spirit is abroad in India which calls for an improvement in the Indian system of Government which has now become an anachronism. Men nurtured on Western ideals and literature must be animated by new aspirations which must be satisfied. The time that Macaulay foresaw—the most glorious day for England—has now arrived. With the growth of new ideas and new aspirations, the Indians insist upon a greater share in the administration of their own affairs. This demand is resisted by an autocratic bureaucracy who are jealous of the slightest encroachment on the privileges of their order. It is admitted on all hands that people of this country are most docile and law-abiding and yet portions of the country are in a state of ferment. This is due not only to the resistance to the demand of the people for a large share in the management of their own affairs, but to the reactionary policy persistently followed in recent years by the Government, and their contempt for public

opinion and the legitimate aspirations of the people. Political life is stirring in India which must be faced in a considerate spirit ; but there has been, as yet, no serious attempt to do so by the Government. The result is general discontent. The bureaucrats are certainly wise in their generation. They defer all reforms till the discontent gathers in volume and leads to seditious movements, when they readily seize on them as a pretext for repression and for indefinitely postponing any experiment in self-government. The Spanish matador, as we all know, maddens the bull with his muleta and then plunges his sword into its neck.

WANTED SYMPATHY

The supreme necessity of the hour is sympathy. We wish to see less and less of the strong hand, and more and more of the strong nerve, the strong head and the kind heart. As the Prime Minister recently said, the Indian administration should be brought into closer contact with the Indian people, and that it is only by an honest, courageous and persistent attempt to do so that England would discharge her momentous trust,—the most momentous trust that was ever committed to a great State. And there never was a time when sympathy was more needed ; for India is truly a country of many sorrows and is stricken sorely by plague and famine.

MR. MORLEY'S REFORMS

And this brings me to the reforms which Mr. Morley shadowed forth towards the end of his speech on the last Indian Budget debate. These were, in addition to a Royal Commission, to enquire into the evils of over-centralisation, first, the institution of an Advisory Council of Notables ; second, the enlargement of the Legislative Councils ; third, the fuller discussion of the Budget in the Viceroy's Council ; and fourth, the nomination of one or two Indians to the Secretary of State's Council in London.

DECENTRALISATION COMMISSION

It would be premature to express any opinion on the work of the Decentralisation Commission. We have,

however, every reason to think that it will strengthen the elective element on Municipal and Local Boards and that the representatives of the people will be associated with the District Officer in the work of Local Administration. I know that most people distrust Commissions, though Lord Curzon was free from any such weakness. But we trust that the Decentralisation Commission will prove an exception to the general rule and lead to great improvements in the administration, as the terms of reference are wide enough to include proposals for advancing the cause of Local Self-Government by strengthening and developing Municipal and Local Boards and by decentralising District Administration. The distribution of power between the Supreme and Provincial Governments is a matter of secondary importance to us. But to what extent our control of Local affairs in Municipalities and District and Local Boards is real—also to what extent the administration of a district by the Collector and District Magistrate is influenced directly and indirectly by the opinion of the people of the district—these are matters of supreme importance. Though we may not be yet in a position to make a correct forecast of the result of the labours of the Commission, our best men must direct their energies towards making these labours fruitful, and this can only be effected by our coming forward in sufficient numbers to give evidence before it. Of course, only such persons should come forward for the purpose as have a fair grasp of these questions and some personal acquaintance with either Local Self-Government or District Administration. The present disposition which, I fear, is general all over the country, to leave the Commission alone is most unfortunate and will only do us harm. We should insist that the composition of Municipal and District and Local Boards should now be entirely or almost entirely elective. We should also insist that the resources at their disposal should be larger than at present. And we should lastly insist that the control of Government over local bodies should be similar to that of the Local Government Board in England, and, as there, it should be exercised only in the interests of efficiency and purity of administration, and that, subject to this control,

local bodies should be free to manage local affairs and spend local resources as they deem best. Then, and then only, would they feel a real sense of responsibility in the matter of local self-government which can never be developed under the present system of constant and harassing interference on the part of officials. As regards district administration, everybody will admit that the Collector and District Magistrate should be emancipated from the present excessive Secretariat control, and, in place of it, every head of a District should have associated with him a Board composed of elected and nominated members, which may at first be entirely or almost entirely advisory, but which, in course of time, should be entrusted with definite and gradually expanding powers of control. All important administrative matters concerning a district, except such as may have to be treated as strictly confidential, should be laid before this Board for advice, which the Collector and District Magistrate should not be at liberty to set aside except for reasons to be recorded in writing. If the experiment succeeds, as it is bound to do, the Board should be empowered to exercise substantial control over most matters of district administration like the administration of excise and forest rules, famine and plague administration.

THE SIMLA SCHEME OF NEW REFORMS

The first three reforms adumbrated by Mr. Morley are now embodied in what is known as the Simla scheme, and I propose to deal with these reforms very briefly. The idea of a Council of Notables is not quite new. A similar measure was tried by Lord Lytton in 1877; but, as Mr. Morley admits, it was a complete failure; and I fear that unless the scheme is considerably modified, the proposed reform will share the same fate. For the Council is sure to be a reactionary body,—an Indian House of Lords, with this difference, that the English House of Lords contains many able and accomplished men who have been trained in Politics from their earliest youth and who are in a large measure in touch with the general trend of public opinion. I do not, however, deny that the proposed Council, if it is properly constituted and its functions

enlarged, may be a useful institution. But the present scheme is open to a variety of objections. In the first place, though Ruling Princes may well be invited to a Council which has to deal with matters touching the welfare of their States or their relations to the paramount power, British subjects alone should be eligible as members of a Council which will have to deal exclusively with questions relating to administration in British India on which Ruling Chiefs are not likely to be able to give much useful advice.

The proposed Council is also open to objection on the ground that the Councillors are not to be consulted collectively but only individually. Then, again, it is absolutely necessary, in order to create confidence and to secure in some measure popular representation, that a certain proportion of the Members should be elected by the different Provinces. The Council should also meet at stated times, and whenever any proposed measure is not accepted by a majority of the Members, it should be dropped or, at any rate, postponed for further consideration. You cannot invite opinions only to flout them.

The proposed reform of the Viceroy's Legislative Council is also open to very serious objections, if indeed it is not a step backwards. It has been almost universally condemned, as the proposal to allow the Local Councils to return only seven out of fifty-four Members would seriously reduce the influence of the educated community who, notwithstanding the sneers at intellectuals, lawyers, and schoolmasters, are the real leaders of public opinion. Distrust, we all know, breeds distrust, and the Government ought not to be surprised if my countrymen regard their proposals with the same suspicion with which the Trojans regarded the friendly gifts of the Greeks.

The functions of the Council should also be enlarged and the debate on the Budget ought to be made a reality instead of a mere academic exercise. This can only be done by allowing the Members to divide on any question on which there may be a difference of opinion on any head

in the Budget. The Council should also be given an opportunity to discussing, under proper safeguards, questions relating to administration on which there is a strong public feeling.

The Provincial Councils should also be expanded on the same lines, and every District should be allowed to return a Member. And the Advisory Boards for assisting Local Governors in carrying on the administration should be constituted on the model of the Council of Notables. All important matters connected with Local Administration should be referred to these Boards for opinion before any action is taken. This is the only way to bring the administration into touch with the people.

I would ask you to consider the Reform Scheme carefully, for I am sure the Government will give due weight to any recommendations which may be made by you. It has been put forward before the public for criticism, and it is our duty to suggest such additions and alterations as would, in our opinion, improve the scheme. It would certainly not be wise to reject the proposal simply because they do not go far enough in a petulant spirit. On the other hand, the Government have no right to be surprised if, in their present mood, my countrymen refuse to be consoled by these rather doubtful concessions for the deportation of British subjects without a trial or the partition of Bengal.

It remains only to add with regard to the fourth proposal of Mr. Morley, that it has already been carried out. It is no doubt a great step forwards but its usefulness will entirely depend on the careful selection of the members. But the selections which have been made, have not commanded general approval. Such approval can only be secured by giving the people a voice in the selection. We must, therefore, ask that whenever an Indian has to be appointed, all elected Members of the several Legislative Councils should be invited to submit three names to the Secretary of State, who should then select one out of the three.

DIVISION IN THE CONGRESS CAMP

I will now pass on to the present position of the National Congress. Gentlemen, it has been said that there is hopeless division in our ranks and that we have now come to the parting of ways. It has been said that we are divided into two parties,—those who place their faith in constitutional methods and those who have lost all faith in them—and that it is impossible for the two parties any longer to act together. Now in a vast organisation like the Indian Congress, which embraces every section of the community, differences of opinion must be inevitable though they cannot be allowed to reach a point which would paralyse our action. Quarrels when they stop short of this only prove not the weakness but the strength of our combination. They show the vigour of life and not the languor of decay. One thing, however, we must not forget. We must not forget that the National Congress is definitely committed only to constitutional methods of agitation to which it is fast moored, and if the new party does not approve of such methods and cannot work harmoniously with the old, everybody must admit it has no place within the pale of the Congress. Secession, therefore, is the only course open to it. But I most fervently hope and trust that nothing of the kind will happen, for are we not all soldiers fighting in the same cause and under the same flag marching together to the golden trumpet-note sounded by Dadabhai Naoroji last year for the great battle of *Swaraj*? Are we not all inspired with the same ideas, the same thoughts, the same desires and the same aspirations?

WHY THE CONGRESS EXISTS

The Congress exists to draw us together and not to divide us. It stands pledged as ever to the larger employment of the people of this country in the Public Services so as to gradually dispense with the present expensive administration. It stands pledged as ever to our larger representation in the Legislative Councils. It stands pledged as ever to the reduction of the enormous military expenditure and to a more equal division of the burden

between England and India. It stands pledged as ever to the limitation of the Land Revenue. It stands pledged as ever to the separation of Executive and Judicial functions. It stands pledged as ever to the *Swadeshi* movement. It stands pledged as ever to the resolution that the Boycott movement in Bengal inaugurated by way of protest against the partition of the Province is a legitimate movement. It stands pledged as ever to the reunion of the people of Bengal under one Administration. And, lastly, it stands pledged as ever to win gradually for the country by all constitutional means that autonomy which England has so wisely granted to her Colonies.

INDUSTRIAL REGENERATION

We all recognise the supreme need of unity and of patriotic sacrifice. We are all agreed that nations are made by themselves. We are all agreed on the necessity of education on National lines and the general elevation of the masses so essential to the attainment of a higher political life. We are all agreed on the necessity of industrial development. For even deeper than political reform, before mere reforms of Government, lies the great question of the industrial regeneration of the country. Let us stand by the *Swadeshi* movement which is founded not on hatred but on love—love of our own country, not hatred of the foreigner. Our creed is short and consists in the development of India for ourselves ; but *Swadeshi* within the limits of the law. It is a patriotic sentiment which involves no disloyalty. We are determined not to use foreign goods so far as practicable, and no amount of repression will deter us from carrying out our resolution. We cannot protect our industries by tariff legislation, but we can show our love for the country by our sympathy for the masses who are now steeped in unspeakable poverty. The Anglo-Indian community, however, have taken fright at this movement, and the Government, too, have been infected by it. They draw a sharp distinction between *Swadeshi* and Boycott ; but unless Boycott is accompanied by violence, is there any real difference between the two ?

WORK IN HARMONY

I confess I see no reason why we should not still be able to work in harmony. A house divided against itself cannot stand, and we must be on our guard against the deadly peril of disunion. The race may not always be to the swift nor the battle to the strong, but depend upon it, without patient discipline and self-control, without courage and determination, without a sense of loyalty, of order and of duty, our enterprise is bound to fail. The citadel of bureaucracy is much stronger than the walls of Jericho. Brother-Delegates, the night is dark and tempestuous. Let us hold together and wait in patience for the dawn, not resting till the bright morning comes, fearless in our faith and strong in our hopes. But this I am painfully compelled to say, that unless wiser counsels prevail, there is bound to be a cleavage when we must part company and the Congress left free to follow the path of constitutional agitation marked out by its founders,—the only path which promises a successful issue.

WHAT THE NEW PARTY SAYS

The new party seems to have persuaded itself that it is hopeless to expect any concessions from our rulers and that political agitation on the lines of the National Congress is a delusion and a snare. The true bureaucrat, it says, does not appreciate moderation and always treats the constitutional reformer with secret contempt. Like the Sinn Fein party in Ireland, it has lost all faith in constitutional movements but it must be said to its credit that it has also no faith in physical force; nor does it advise the people not to pay taxes with the object of embarrassing the Government. I am of course speaking of the leaders. All its hopes are centred in passive resistance of a most comprehensive kind, derived, I presume, from the modern history of Hungary, the pacific boycott of all things English. If I understand its programme aright, we must refuse to serve Government in any capacity either as paid servants or as members of Legislative Councils, Local Boards or Municipalities. British Courts of Justice too

should be placed under a ban and courts of arbitration substituted for them—a proposal, by the way, which shows that the agitation is not the work of hungry lawyers. All schools and colleges maintained by the Government should also be boycotted. In a word, we must get rid of our habit of leaning on the Government and create in its place a habit of thinking and acting as if the Government were not. All this, however, is to be effected not by physical force but by social pressure; for there has as yet arisen no party to counsel violence or any other breach of the law.

A COUNSEL OF DESPAIR

Now it seems to me, to put it mildly, that this is a counsel of despair which may appeal to "the impatient idealist", but which is foredoomed to failure. I speak not in anger but in sorrow; for it is quite possible to sympathise with this new phase of patriotism, this yearning for an unattainable ideal. But we must look facts in the face. We must recognise them loyally, and if it is true that no man is ever good for much who has not in his youth been carried off his feet by fiery enthusiasm, it is equally true he needs the bit and the bridle. For enthusiasm, unless controlled by sound judgment, frequently ends in ghastly tragedies.

You all know the story of the city with the three gates with their inscriptions: the first said "Be bold"; the second "Be bold and ever more be bold"; while the third and last inscription which the horseman read was "Be not too bold". You forget that rashness is not courage. You forget that hasty maxims drawn from the history of other nations and other times are extremely dangerous, as the conditions are never the same, and action which produces a certain result in one country at one time may lead to directly opposite result in another country and at another time. You forget that there is no doctrine so universal and comprehensive that you are bound to act upon it at all hazards. You forget, it may be a cynical remark, but it is perfectly true, that though a martyr may be worshipped for his sufferings and his

sacrifices, he is not always counted among the wisest of men and his example is more frequently admired than followed. I need not go far afield to seek for illustrations. You pride yourselves on the idea that you alone have the courage of your convictions and that the Moderate Party are disloyal to their country and would betray her with a kiss. But you forget that there is a faith, and, perhaps, as has been rightly said, a deeper faith which knows how to stand still and wait patiently till the fruit is ripe and may be gathered without violence. Your aims may be generous but do not drag the country into perils which you do not foresee but which are sure to follow on your methods. The millennium surely will not arrive when all Government Colleges and Schools are closed, when all Municipal and District Boards are abolished and elected members refuse to sit in the Legislative Councils of the Empire. Petulance is not manliness. It is easy to revile authority in season and out of season, but not so easy to build up a nation. Of one thing I am sure. One thing I know. Mere rant, however full of fire, will not help us. What we want is action, leadership and discipline. What we want is earnest work in co-operation with the Government, if possible, but in any case in conformity with moral and constitutional methods. Temporary failures must not discourage us. Hopes deferred must not sicken us. We must pursue our course with that courage which inspires the soldier in a forlorn hope with heart for any fate, conscious of our integrity and conscious of the nobleness of our cause.

I implore you not to persevere, in your present course. Do not be beguiled by mere phantoms. You cannot put an end to British Rule by boycotting the administration. Your only chance under the present circumstances of gaining your object lies in co-operation with the Government in every measure which is likely to hasten our political emancipation; for so long as we do not show ourselves worthy of it, rely upon it England will maintain her rule, and if you really want Self-Government, you must show that you are fit for such responsibility. Then

and then only will the English retire from India, their task completely accomplished, and their duty done.

THE NEW PARTY NOT TO BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY

But suppose your movement is successful and the English retire from the country, leaving the people to stew in their own juice. Imagine the chaos and disorder into which the whole country would be immediately plunged. I really cannot—I hope to be forgiven for this remark—take the members of the new party seriously; I believe they are at present only in a sulky mood, because constitutional and peaceful methods have failed. They say that the National Congress has been for years only ploughing the sands of the sea-shore, that all prospects of reasonable concessions are more and more receding into the distance and that we are deluding ourselves and our countrymen in persevering in our mendicant policy. Arguments, they say, are of no avail nor supplications however humble. They are always met by insult and by contempt. Now I venture to think that this mood betrays an impatience which the history of every reform shows to be in the highest degree unreasonable—a sullen and angry mood which may readily slide into a temper which would be a menace to law and order and would furnish our enemies with the plea that public tranquillity can only be secured by repression. You may deny it, but I fear you are in danger of slowly but surely drifting into treason.

Do not, I beseech you, play the game of our enemies but be staunch to the Congress as ever and abide by the principles, and follow the chart laid down by its founders. Do you believe that we do not feel as strongly as you do the unjust disabilities under which we labour? Do you believe that we do not feel as strongly as you do our exclusion from our legitimate share in the administration of the country? Do you believe that we do not feel as strongly as you do the annual drain which is impoverishing the country? Do you believe that we do not feel as strongly as you do the burden of the military expenditure which arrests all progress and but for which the country

would have been covered with a network of schools, with free primary education within the reach of the masses? Do you believe that we are not as determined as you are to work out our political emancipation?

CONGRESS WORK IN ENGLAND

But I ask you seriously if it would not be madness to give up constitutional agitation either here or in England, especially in England, where public opinion, not of the classes but of the great democracy, is now the dominating factor in politics. I do not invite you to supplicate with bated breath and whispering humbleness, but to demand of a nation, jealous of its honour, a fulfilment of the pledges which have been repeatedly given to us. What lies in our way is the utter ignorance of the English people about us. They have been led to believe that the administration of India is perfect; but if they were made acquainted with the real condition of the country at the present day, they would gladly support such reforms as we demand; though we must be prepared for the opposition of those classes whose vested interests might be imperilled by any reform. We must, therefore, try to educate English public opinion. And that public opinion, when well informed and not warped by lies, is sure to be essentially just. It is only by enlisting such opinion on our side that we can hope to achieve our objects. We must, therefore, endeavour to place our views before the people of England by every means in our power, by active agitation on the Platform and in the Press. Remember that we have very powerful enemies, who try their best to mislead the nation, and we can only hope to meet them by creating a powerful body of opinion in our favour among the people who have been so recently emancipated and whose sympathy must always be with those who are only claiming the ordinary rights of British citizenship.

BRITISH CONGRESS COMMITTEE

This is now the task of the British Committee in London, whose services, however, have not received that

recognition or support, which is undoubtedly due to them. Our friends in England have been unremitting in their exertions and if we have escaped more rigorous repressive measures, we owe it to them and to them alone. They have not only laboured to promote our welfare but have spent their own money for us, and I am not using the language of exaggeration when I say that they have poured out money like water in our cause.

INDIAN AGITATION IN ENGLAND

I do not deny that we must rely on our own right hand to build up our national strength; but the only power that can control the bureaucracy now is to be found in England. Depend upon it, political agitation in England is not a mere waste of energy and of money. It is sure to improve the system of administration and to galvanize it into new life. Measures like free primary education, for instance, will appeal readily to the sympathies of the English people and will be forced on the bureaucracy, who, if left to themselves, would put it off indefinitely; for they have studied one art in perfection, the art of writing minutes and of not doing anything. Then, again, the exposure of official wrong-doing is sure to have a sobering effect on the bureaucracy. Agitation, therefore, in England must be carried on actively and persistently, not apathetically or intermittently, and I would specially recommend this question to the attention of the Congress. But we must work with courage and determination, without expecting immediate results and confidently leave the issue to time. Above all, we must try to win back the confidence of the English Nation which has been forfeited by the wild utterances of some irresponsible agitators and the lies and calumnies industriously spread by those who hate the people and would keep them in a state of perpetual tutelage. It is these men who led Mr. Morley and the Indian Government to believe that there was real danger of a conflagration, which, we know, never existed. It is these men who have deterred a Liberal Government from making any substantial concessions. It is these men who have induced

the English people to distrust not only our loyalty but also our competency to manage our own affairs.

CONCLUSION

I repeat that though our progress may be slow, we must not lose heart; no, not even if the dial is set back; for such things are inevitable in the course of human affairs. But depend upon it, unless History is a record of lies, Englishmen love freedom as their most cherished possession; but do not forget that the freedom they love is freedom broadening slowly from precedent to precedent. I repeat that our object can only be achieved by constitutional agitation and not by leaving Government severely alone. Visions may be sublime but they are not real; and a universal Boycott, which would make administration impossible, seems to be the figment of a disordered imagination. Privileges have to be manfully fought for, and it would be puerile to turn away from the struggle, simply because our first attempts are not crowned by tangible immediate results. For my part, I have never despaired and I refuse to despair.

Twenty-third Congress—Madras—1908

HON. DR. RASH BEHARI GHOSE, C.I.E.

BROTHER-DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—The fears which for months haunted the minds of some of us have proved groundless. The genial predictions of our enemies so confidently made have also been falsified. For the Indian National Congress is not dead, nor has Surat been its grave. It has been more than once doomed to death but, rely upon it, it bears a charmed life and is fated not to die. It is true a few men have left us, but the Congress is as vigorous as ever. We have now closed up our ranks, and though some of us clung convulsively to the hope that those who have now deliberately committed political suicide would still continue to fight the good fight and keep the faith, they soon found out their mistake. There can be no reconciliation with the irreconcilable.

The first ominous sign of a movement which has since unmasked itself appeared in the Benares Congress in December 1905, after the reactionary policy of Lord Curzon had culminated in the partition of Bengal. It was at Benares that the boycott of English goods which had been started in Bengal by way of protest against the partition of the province was declared to be legitimate, not however without some opposition from those who thought that such a step might ultimately end in active hostility to the Government. The new movement started in 1905 reached its second stage in Calcutta, where there was a stormy session and an open rupture was averted only by the tact and authority of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. By that

time the new party, who made no secret of their contempt for the Moderates, had sketched out a comprehensive policy of passive resistance modelled on the Irish Sinn Féin. They insisted on a boycott not only of English goods but of the English Government itself, though their policy was veiled under the name of self-help and self-reliance. The relations between the two parties thus became strained almost to the breaking-point in 1906, and the struggle had reached a still more menacing stage before we met at Surat last year, when the session had to be suspended amid tumultuous and unedifying scenes. And why?—simply because the Congress refused to be dragged from its old moorings by the new currents which had been set in motion. Our National Congress has, I need hardly remind you, from the very beginning strictly adhered to constitutional methods of agitation and has never encouraged disloyalty of any sort or kind. It is true, like all other institutions, it has passed through the inevitable process of evolution, but it has never, never faltered in its loyal devotion to the Empire. And at Surat it remained firm to its creed and refused to purchase unity at the price of principle and of loyalty.

Now, I will not wander into the boundless realm of the might-have-been but will only say this: Those who have gone out of us were never of us, for if they had been of us they would no doubt have continued with us. Our paths now lie wide apart, and a yawning gulf separates us. It is, however, permissible to us still to hope that these wayward wanderers, if I may say so without offence, may yet come back to us and be ours again, joining hands and hearts with us and fighting under the old banner—the banner to which we have always been true, and by which we have again solemnly pledged ourselves to stand, never again to part. But we will not, we cannot, we dare not extend the hand of fellowship to them so long as they persist in their present policy.

We have been charged with having imposed a new constitution without a mandate from the Congress, but I can hardly believe that our accusers are serious. In the

first place, I would remind them that there is no question whatever of complusion or of a brand-new constitution. The constitution is not brand-new nor is anybody compelled to accept it. In the next place, is it not the idlest pedantry to say that the convention which we were driven to summon at Surat when the regular machinery had broken down—a convention at which over eight hundred delegates were present—had no authority at all to act in the unforeseen emergency which had arisen? If we were always obliged to move only in the beaten path, we could not move at all. "In a wilderness," said Maynard on an historical occasion, "a man should take the track which will carry him home and should not stand crying: 'Where is the King's highway? I walk nowhere but on the King's highway'." There are also other precedents familiar to every student of history. But what is the use of speaking of precedents or of history or of the counsels of common sense to those who, for their own purposes, are determined to belittle the Indian National Congress?

Brother-Delegates, I must confess it was not without considerable misgiving that I accepted the invitation of the Reception Committee to preside at the present session as I was then inclined in common with most of my countrymen to take a very gloomy view of our position and prospects. For if the situation last year was full of grave anxiety, the year which is just closing was marked by still more sinister omens. I am not, I trust, a pessimist; but a succession of repressive laws and deportations under a lawless law will sap even the most robust optimism. In the course of the last few days, however, the condition of things has entirely changed, and the clouds which darkened the political sky and which we watched so long with fear and trembling are now dissolving in rain.

The clouds you so much dread
Are big with mercy and shall break
In blessings on your head.

They are now breaking in blessings over your heads, slaking the parched and thirsty earth. English statesmanship which, as Lord Morley justly boasted, has never yet

failed in any part of the world, has risen to its fullest height at this critical time, and has seized the golden moment, for it knows the season when to take occasion by the hand, not to suppress but to guide the new spirit which England has created in India. To have dropped the policy, of conciliation at the present moment would have been a sign not of strength but of weakness; for in justice alone lies the strength of rulers—justice which owes no account to the little prudences of the hour. And English statesmanship has dared to be just, because England has a national conscience. It has dared to be just because it knows no fear. It has dared to be just because it has no real faith in the cult of canteen ballads—the tinsel imperialism, which tells us that the white man was created only to bear the burden of the brown.

The reforms which have now been announced were foreshadowed in the King-Emperor's message which came to cheer us in our hour of deepest gloom and dejection, of affliction and of shame. It was truly a message of peace and goodwill, full of the most kindly, most sympathetic, most friendly feelings towards his Indian subjects breathing the same noble sentiments which inspired the Proclamation of Queen Victoria. It has been said that the manifesto is spiritless and rather superfluous. It was not, I make bold to assert, spiritless nor superfluous. It was not spiritless, because it solemnly reaffirmed the great Charter of 1858. It was not superfluous because it distinctly announced a policy of progressive development in the direction of self-government.

The language of the Queen's Proclamation, the key-note of which was the equality of races, was perhaps equally plain on one point. But can any one truthfully assert that it received a generous interpretation in practice? Did not a brilliant Viceroy attempt to explain it away in a famous speech and deliberately lay down the policy of excluding Indians from the higher branches of the service? The National Congress protested against this policy, but Lord Curzon would not pay the slightest attention to our protest. He would not be Lord Curzon,

if he did. We have a right to bring against his Lordship the same charge that Shylock brought against Antonio—'he hath scorned my nation'—a nation justly proud of their literature, justly proud of their philosophy and justly proud of their ancient civilization.

We are now, Brother-Delegates, on the threshold of a new era. An important chapter has been opened in the history of the relations between Great Britain and India—a chapter of constitutional reform which promises to unite the two countries together in closer bonds than ever. A fair share in the government of our own country has now been given to us. The problem of reconciling order with progress, efficient administration with the satisfaction of aspirations encouraged by our rulers themselves, which timid people thought was insoluble, has at last been solved. The people of India will now be associated with the Government in the daily and hourly administration of their affairs. A great step forward has thus been taken in the grant of representative government for which the Congress had been crying for years.

One of the leading features of the proposed reforms which are all based upon a progressive policy is the extension of local self-government, perhaps the most potent instrument of political education. This is not entirely a new departure, but the policy with which the honoured name of Lord Ripon will always be associated never had a fair trial. A single-minded English nobleman of the best type, Lord Ripon believed that righteousness exalteth a nation. He believed that a nation like an individual has a conscience, and that England's duty to India would be discharged only by making the people gradually fit for self-government. The development of local self-government was, therefore, one of the objects nearest to his heart. But who does not know the fate of the measures introduced by him? Who does not remember the angry controversy which surged round Lord Ripon's administration? Who does not remember the threats of a white mutiny? Who does not remember the open insults to the Queen's representative? It was not the

Ilbert Bill, Brother-Delegates, which convulsed the Anglo-Indian world but Lord Ripon's attempt to give the local representative councils some actual share in the government of their district. And it was certainly not his Lordship's fault if the reforms proposed by him proved a mere Barmecide feast.

But we are no longer going to be fed on illusions. Henceforth we shall have an effective voice in directing the policy of the Government in the administration of the country. Henceforth we shall be able to initiate discussion on all questions of public importance, and to pass resolutions which, though they may not be binding upon the Government, are sure to receive attention. Indian members will also be admitted to the Executive Councils. The debate on the Budget again will be a real debate and not a mere academic discussion, while the right of interpellation will be considerably widened. Henceforth too the executive will not be able to control all provincial legislation. In a word, we shall now have something like a constitutional government in the place of an autocratic and irresponsible administration. Lord Morley has also promised, not obscurely, that the Bombay and Madras system will be introduced into the larger sister-provinces. And if the principle of dispensing with an official majority has not been for the present extended to the Imperial Council, we have no doubt its application will not long be withheld, if the result of the experiment in the Provincial Councils proves satisfactory.

The reform scheme has no doubt been very carefully thought out, but it is impossible to say that it is not susceptible of improvement. And it is quite open to you to suggest such alterations as would facilitate its practical working, and I am sure any reasonable representations made by you will receive every attention from the authorities. I would therefore invite your attention to the best method of securing the proper representation of the people in the Legislative Councils, and in this connection I would ask you to consider the question of the constitution of the electoral colleges. It would also be for you to consider

whether the appointment at least of one Indian member to the Executive Councils should not be guaranteed by Statute, instead of being left to the pleasure of the Secretary of State for India for the time being. We cannot always have a Morley at the helm in England, nor a Minto at the head of the administration in India.

Brother-Delegates, we do not know what the future destiny of India may be. We can see only as through a glass darkly. But of this I am assured, that on our genuine co-operation with the British Government depend our future progress and the development of a fuller social and political life. Of this also I am assured that the future of the country is now in a large measure in our own hands. And we owe it to ourselves, we owe it to the Government which have generously recognised the justice of many of our claims, to show that we are deserving of the confidence of our rulers. And, above all, we owe it to our countrymen to give that generous support to the Government which can alone promote their happiness and lead to further reforms. If we are apathetic or do not wisely exercise the privileges now given to us, we shall show to the world that we are unfit for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. The fault will be ours—ours too the humiliation and the disgrace. Remember that our enemies will always be on the watch, and if we fail to discharge our duties properly, the fate of the country will be sealed. Speaking for myself, I have no such craven fears. I am confident that we shall all loyally co-operate with the Government in promoting the welfare of the country. And I am equally confident that such co-operation will strengthen existing authority and impart to the administration an efficiency which a foreign bureaucracy with the best intentions can never hope to attain.

To the impatient reformer who thinks that the proposed measures are in some respects inadequate my answer is, that to disdain anything short of an organic change in institutions is nothing short of political madness. Remember there is no finality in politics, and the most ardent patriot must see the wisdom of accepting reforms,

which if they give satisfactory results are sure to lead up to larger reforms. Of one thing I am certain. The nation as a whole will accept these reforms not in a spirit of carping criticism, but with the deepest gratitude.

And this reminds me that we cannot be too thankful to Lord Minto, who has displayed a rare courage and firmness in trying times and has steadily refused, though determined to put down lawlessness, to follow the unwise policy of his predecessor, which has given rise to all those troubles he is meeting so manfully.

Lord Curzon seems to think that he has seized the full meaning of the new movement. In his lordship's opinion, and we know that what Lord Curzon asserts even once must be true, the whole of the unrest is due to the study of Mill on Liberty and Burke on the French Revolution. Lord Curzon also speaks of the victory of Japan over Russia and the whispering galleries of the East, and protests against the notion that the readjustment of the boundaries of Bengal—his euphemism for the partition of the province—has in any way contributed to the ferment. Now I confess I cannot speak with the authority of Lord Curzon; for I know of no calculus which can integrate the minute but powerful forces which are stirring in the hearts of New India. But I may remind you that the history of the unrest was sketched by a masterhand only the other day in England, and I am not presumptuous enough to think that I can improve on the picture drawn by Mr. Gokhale. I will only venture to add that acquittals or very light sentences in some criminal cases in which the accused belonged to the governing race have contributed not a little to the general discontent. Another potent cause which many thoughtful Englishmen have noticed with deep regret is the insolence and the overbearing language of some members of the ruling class. Of course, we do not, for obvious reasons, expect to find in the manners of every Englishman in this country the repose which stamps the caste of Vere de Vere, but aggressive rudeness in language and behaviour might easily be avoided.

By one of those strange ironies of fate, so common in political history, Lord Minto was called upon to face the unhappy consequences of Lord Curzon's policy. He felt himself compelled owing to the growing discontent to enact repressive laws to restrain freedom of speech and of public meetings. But as all experience tells us, secret crime invariably dogs the footsteps of coercion. That which has happened in every other country happened in India—discontent was driven beneath the surface. The effect of repression on those who were too young to be wise, too impulsive to be rational, has been simply disastrous. Some of them who at first refused to meddle with Cæsar or with the things that belonged to Cæsar and said they would obey him in his place, began to dally with treason and were not long in embracing it; for the first false step in all such cases generally leads by a tragic necessity to that easy descent with which we are all familiar. But the number of such persons was very small, infinitesimally small. And Mr. Tilak, for many years the central figure in the new movement in which he played a notable part, shall be my witness. That gentleman very candidly told an Englishman who was travelling in this country last year: "Certainly, there is a very small party which talks about abolishing British rule at once and completely; that does not concern us; it is much too far in the future. Unorganised, disarmed, and still disunited we should not have a chance of shaking the British suzerainty." It cannot certainly be shaken by a little picric acid and a few flasks of gunpowder.

And this leads me to remark that we have been charged with having maintained an ignoble silence in this time of crisis. Our first answer to this indictment is that we have not been silent. Our second answer is that we have no faith in mere protestations of loyalty which must be superfluous. When certain British subjects in the Cape told Lord Milner that they were loyal to the Crown, his lordship replied: "Loyal, of course you are loyal, it would be monstrous if you were not." Let us free our minds of cant, of "nonsense talk" to use the language of

the Maharaja of Benares, a phrase which, I believe, is destined to be historical. What, I ask, would an Englishman say if he was asked to join in a loyal demonstration,—what would be his feeling? Would he not treat the invitation as an insult? As I said only the other day from my place in the Viceregal Council, we must be mad if we were really disloyal. But we disdain all spurious loyalty. We are not Pharisees. We do not wear our loyalty on our sleeves, for it is above all suspicion. 'I'doubt our loyalty is to doubt our sanity. We condemn from the bottom of our hearts all seditious movements and we condemn anarchism most; because it is opposed to the laws of God as well as of man. But with the reforms in the administration, we are confident that sedition will wear itself out. Anarchism sometimes dies hard. But it will die, it is bound to die in Hindusthan, because it is in opposition to the best traditions of our race. Anarchism, I repeat, is bound to die, because it is in opposition to all those precepts of pity and of compassion for the lowliest of God's creatures, which are our great, our priceless heritage, and which have raised man from a brute, to a height a little lower than the angels.

A season of universal rejoicing is not the time to make unfriendly criticisms on the action of the Government in enacting repressive laws, and I hope and trust that the memory of these drastic measures will now be buried in oblivion in the same grave with the misdeeds of a few misguided political fanatics. We must also remember that though the Government have been armed with some new weapons, they have been rarely used. Thus the Public Meetings Act was put into force only in one district and that only for one year. The Press Act again has been called in aid only in three cases. Speaking for myself, I am not enamoured of a measure which is a serious menace to the freedom of the Press. But in fairness to the Government, we should remember that in the present state of the country a temporary measure of the kind was perhaps necessary. The distinction between the approval of a recent crime and the discussion of an

abstract proposition, like the morality of the action of Harmodius and Aristogiton, is always very fine; but those who engage in such discussions in times of public excitement should know that they can only do so at their peril. I trust, however, that when the present excitement subsides, prosecutions for seditious writings or speeches will be very rare. Incitements to violence must be punished and organised lawlessness must be put down with a strong hand. But history shows that you cannot prevent the spread of opinions, however mischievous, by sending the speaker or writer to gaol; for you cannot imprison the mind. Outrages, and direct incitements to outrages, must, I repeat, be punished and punished severely. But argument can only be met by argument. Coercion and even the appearance of coercion tend to create only distrust and suspicion. We all know the story of Jupiter and the rustic who listened with attention as long as the god tried to convince him by argument, but when, on his happening to hint a doubt, Jupiter threatened him with his thunder, said: "Now I know that you are wrong, Jupiter, for you never appeal to your thunder when you are right."

And this brings me to the numerous prosecutions for sedition during the course of the year. There have been altogether, I believe, about twenty prosecutions and as many convictions. A prosecution for sedition, however, ought not to be started merely because a conviction is certain; for in moments of political passion when feeling runs high, an editor or speaker who is convicted of sedition, however rightly, is sure to be regarded by a section of the people as a martyr. And we do not want any fresh additions to the new Indian hagiology. The roll is already long enough. "He has set his heart upon being a martyr," said William the Third of an acrimonious Jacobite, "and I have set mine on disappointing him." Lord Macaulay contrasts the policy of William the Third with that of his father-in-law, who refused to remit a cruel sentence of flogging passed upon a clergyman, saying: "Mr. Johnson has the spirit of a martyr, and it is fit that

he should be one." "These two speeches," observes the historian, "would alone suffice to explain the widely different fates of the two princes." I am, I know, stating a mere commonplace fit to adorn copy books when I say that criticism, however trenchant or drastic, cannot do much harm, so long as the administration is in a sound condition. It is sure to come to naught; for it must always be powerless against the innate conservatism of a settled and civilized society. The true secret of the power of agitators is, as Macaulay pointed out long ago, the obstinacy of the rulers. A liberal government always makes a moderate people; and this is as true of the East as of the West.

It has been said by a well known writer on constitutional law that the legal definition of a seditious libel might, if rigidly interpreted, put down all prevailing forms of political agitation. But a jury are not bound by a too strict interpretation of law, and a man, therefore, may publish anything in England, which twelve of his countrymen think is not blamable. In India, where in trials for sedition, the safeguard of a jury composed of the countrymen of the accused is wanting, a prosecution can only be justified, when the public peace is imperilled by wild writings or speeches. As the Court of Directors said, not only should justice be done, but people should be made to see that justice is being done. When, however, an Indian is convicted of a political offence, I do not know of any glasses which will make his friends see that justice has been done.

However this may be, the severity of the sentences in many cases has undoubtedly called forth very strong comments even from those who have no sympathy whatever with seditious utterances. Braxfield was not a model judge. But no candid man can deny that the convention which sat in Edinburgh towards the end of the 18th century actually aimed at revolution. It was only the harsh sentences that sank deep into the minds of the Scottish people, whose feelings found expression half a century afterwards in the Martyrs'

Memorial on Cotton Hill. Now the East may be the East, and the West may be the West, as the uncrowned Poet Laureate of the new imperialism assures us. But the propriety of a sentence is not a question of latitude and longitude. It is also permissible to doubt whether a system which places political offenders on a level with ordinary criminals is absolutely perfect. They should at least be spared the humiliation of herding with felons.

Would it be too presumptuous to hope that if everything goes on well and the country settles down, as it must in a short time, a general amnesty will be granted to all political offenders and that those who have been deported will be restored to their homes? Would it again be too presumptuous to hope that the Partition of Bengal will be modified? A more unpopular measure was never passed by the Government. Our grievance may be a mere sentimental grievance, but a sentimental grievance really means a grievance that is felt. The wound which was inflicted in 1905 will never heal, and it would be lamentable, if the success of Lord Morley's liberal policy was jeopardised in the slightest degree by his failure to undo a grave administrative error—the greatest blunder, according to Lord McDonnell, ever made in India. I have pleaded more than once for the modification of the Partition, and have no desire on the present occasion to repeat myself. But this, I am bound to say, even the liberal concessions now made may, in some measure, lose their savour, if this great administrative blunder is long allowed to remain unredressed. The Partition may be a settled fact, but it is still an unsettled question.

I find I must stop. I should have liked to say a few words on the rapid and appalling growth of military expenditure and the recent addition of an annual burden of forty-five lakhs of rupees against which Lord Minto and his Council, always watchful of the interests of the Indian taxpayer, have entered a strong protest. I should have also liked to say something on the delay in carrying out the solemn promise made nearly two years ago, that primary

education shall be free and judicial functions separated from the executive. I should have also liked to make a few remarks on the high mortality from plague and malaria, on the Universities Act and Regulations which many people fear are likely to hinder the growth of high education in this country. But I feel, I cannot detain you much longer.

I cannot, however, conclude without referring to the very severe loss which the Indian National Congress has sustained in the death of Mr. Ananda Charlu. India was still mourning the loss of her foremost lawyer, when our friend followed Sir Bhashyam Ayyangar to the grave. A distinguished scholar and a great lawyer, Mr. Charlu will perhaps be best remembered as one of the pioneers of the Congress movement. Behind a playful humour, there was in him a singleness of purpose, a devotion to duty, and an independence of character, which made him a most prominent figure in the public life not only of Madras but of the whole country. He has been taken away from us at a most critical moment when more than ever his wisdom and experience would have helped us in our deliberations. But as I have said more than once men like Mr. Ananda Charlu do not really die.

Mourn not therefore, nor lament it,
That the world outlives their life;
Voice and vision yet they give us,
Making strong our hands for strife.

It only remains for me now to thank you for the honour which you have conferred upon me. Believe me I am not using merely an idle phrase when I say that I am proud of the distinction; and I am especially proud of my good fortune in being privileged to preside at this meeting, as the present year will be a memorable year in the history of the country. But those who succeed me will, I will make bold to say, be still more fortunate. For they will, I hope, at no distant date be able to congratulate the country on a substantial reduction in the military expenditure and a more equitable division of the burden. They will also, I hope, be able to point to the steady

substitution of Indian for European agency in the public service, to the wider and wider diffusion of primary education, to more and more improved sanitation, to a larger and larger reduction of the land revenue, and the ultimate repeal of the tax on salt which is still a heavy load on the poor. They will also, I hope, be able to tell the assembled delegates how the success of the experiment which is now going to be made has encouraged the Government to give the people a larger and larger control over the financial and executive administration of the country. They will also, I hope, be able to tell their audience how the Indian is no longer treated as an undesirable alien in any part of the Empire, and how the bar-sinister has been completely wiped out. They will also be able to congratulate the country on the repeal of Regulation III of 1818, a barbarous relic from the past—an unweeded remnant which ought to have been extirpated long ago. They will also, I hope, be able to point with pride to social and material progress, to the growth of indigenous industries, to the investment of Indian capital in the development of the resources of the country, to improvements in agriculture and to the growing prosperity of the masses now plunged in hopeless poverty. They will also, I hope, be able to tell their audience that the establishment of technical colleges and the promotion of works of irrigation have for ever driven away the gaunt spectre of famine from the land. And when in the fulness of time the people have outgrown the present system of administration and have proved themselves fit for self-government, an exultant President of the Indian National Congress will be able to announce to a united people amid universal rejoicing the extension to India of the colonial type of Government.

But pray do not misunderstand me; and, to guard myself against any possible misconception, I am bound to tell you that this ideal is not likely to be realised in the near future. But to those who say that it is absolutely impossible of attainment and mock at our hopes our answer is plain. We may assure them that we are not the

slaves of mere phrases. We are not impatient Utopians filled with ecstatic visions ; for we know of no talisman which can make a nation in an hour. We know that our hopes are not likely to be realised in a day. We know that for years we may not have even a Pisgah sight of the promised land. But to blot out the ideal is, according to the Greek saying, to take the spring from out of the year. It is at once our solace and our inspiration, our pole-star to guide us. We know that in the struggle we shall suffer many defeats. But there are defeats which do not involve any disgrace. There are repulses which carry no humiliation. And if ever we are seized with despondency we shall not forget that, in a national movement, endurance itself is a victory and the keeping alive of the national spirit is itself an end. Our triumph may be very remote but, depend upon it, we can never suffer permanent defeat. And we are determined to fight the good fight with unextinguishable faith, with unwavering hope and strenuous patience, nerved and sustained by the conviction that a just cause can never fail with the people of England. In quietness and in confidence shall be our strength and persuasion and discussion shall be our only weapons.

The wisdom of confining ourselves only to aims which are immediately capable of being realised is not true wisdom, for I believe with Lord Acton, most philosophic of historians, that the pursuit of a remote and ideal object arrests the imagination by its splendour and captivates the reason by its simplicity, and thus calls forth energy which would not be inspired by a rational, possible end, confined to what is reasonable, practicable, and just. But we are not impracticable reformers, for we know that there is a time and season for everything and that all questions are not for all times. I repeat we cherish no illusions. We know that the way is long and hard, we know the danger of taking even a single unwary step, but we are determined to make the road easier for those who will follow us in ever-increasing numbers.

Man goes forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening. But the evening comes, before his work or

task is done. Others however will take up the work which is left unfinished. Yes, a younger generation will take up the work who will, I trust, have some kindly thoughts for those who too in their day strove to do their duty, however imperfectly, through good report and through evil report, with, it may be, a somewhat chastened fervour, but, I may say without boasting, with a fervour as genuine as that which stirs and inspires younger hearts.

Others I doubt not, if not we,
The issue of our toils shall see ;
Young children gather as their own,
The harvest that the dead had sown ;
The dead forgotten and unknown.

Twenty-fourth Congress—Lahore—1909.

HON. PANDIT MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA

INTRODUCTION

BROTHER-DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—When I received intimation in a rather out-of-the-way place in the mofussil where I was engaged in professional work, that some Congress Committees had very kindly nominated me for election as President of the Congress, I wired, as there was no time to be lost in the matter, to my honoured friend Mr. Wacha, the General Secretary of the Congress, to inform him that I was too weak from the effects of a recent illness, as I am sorry to say I still am, to be able to undertake the duties and responsibilities of the high office of President of the Congress. I need hardly say, Ladies and Gentlemen, that it was not that I did not fully appreciate the high honour which it was proposed to confer upon me. The Presidentship of the Congress, as has often been said, is the highest honour that can come to any Indian. But, I am sorry to confess, I was not cheered up by the prospect of receiving it, because I really believed that I did not deserve it. I knew how unworthy I was to occupy the chair which had been filled in the past by a succession of eminently able and distinguished men who had established their title to the esteem and confidence of their countrymen long before they were called on to preside over this great national assembly of India. Besides this general consideration, I had present to my mind the special fact that I would be required to fill the chair which Congressmen all over the country and the public at large had been

expecting would be graced by that distinguished countryman of ours who towers above others by his commanding ability and influence, I need hardly name Sir Pheroze Shah Mehta; and I felt that the election of a humble soldier from the ranks as I am, to step into the breach created by the retirement of such a veteran leader, could but deepen the already deep disappointment and regret which has been felt all over the country by his resignation of this office. In addition to all this I could not forget that with the exception of a single short speech, I had never in my life been able to write out a speech, and I could not expect, especially when there were hardly six days left before me to do it, to be able to write out anything like an address which is expected from the Presidential Chair of the Congress. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, all my objections expressed and implied, were over-ruled, and such as I am, I am here, in obedience to the mandate issued under your authority, to serve you and our Motherland as best I may relying on the grace of God and the support of all my brother-Congressmen. This fact cannot however diminish, it rather deepens, the gratitude which I feel to you for the signal honour you have conferred upon me in electing me your President at this juncture. Words fail me to express what I feel. I thank you for it from the bottom of my heart. You will agree with me when I say that no predecessor of mine ever stood in need of greater indulgence and more unstinted support from the Congress than I do. I trust you will extend it to me with the same generosity and kindly feeling with which you have voted me to this exalted office.

MESSRS. LAL MOHAN GHOSE AND R. C. DUTT

Before I proceed to deal with other matters, it is my painful but sacred duty to offer a tribute of respect to the memory of two of the past Presidents of the Congress and of one distinguished benefactor of the country whom the hand of death has removed from our midst. In the death of Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose, we mourn the loss of one of the greatest orators that India has produced. Of his

matchless eloquence it is not necessary for me to speak. He combined with it a wonderful grasp of great political questions, and long before the Congress was born, he employed his great gifts in pleading the cause of his country before the tribunal of English public opinion. The effect which his eloquent advocacy produced on the minds of our fellow-subjects in England was testified to by no less eminent a man than John Bright, the great tribune of the English people. To Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose will always belong the credit of having been the first Indian who made a strenuous endeavour to get admission into the great Parliament of England. It is sad to think that his voice will not be heard any more either in asserting the rights of his countrymen to equality of treatment with their European fellow-subjects or in chastening those who insult them, after the manner of his memorable Dacca speech.

Even more poignant and profound has been the regret with which the news of the death of Mr. Romesh Chander Dutt has been received throughout the country. Mr. Dutt has had the glory of dying in harness in the service of his Motherland. It is not for me to dwell here on the varied and high attainments and of the various activities of a life which was so richly distinguished by both. Time would not permit of my referring to Mr. Dutt's work on the Decentralisation Commission or in Baroda, or to his numerous contributions to literature, history and economics. But I cannot omit to mention his contributions to the vernacular literature of Bengal. Mr. Dutt recognised with the true insight of a statesman that to build up a nation it was necessary to create a national literature and he made rich and copious contributions to the vernacular of his province. An able administrator, a sagacious statesman, a distinguished scholar, a gifted poet, a charming novelist, a deep student of Indian history and economics, and, above all, a passionate lover of his country who united to a noble pride and deep reverence for its glorious past, a boundless faith in the possibilities of its future, and laboured incessantly for its realisation up to the

Last moment of his life. Mr. Dutt was a man of whom any country might be proud. (*Cheers*) It was no small tribute to his work and worth that that patriot-prince, the Gaekwar chose him for his adviser, and found in him a man after his heart. Grievous would have been the loss of such a man at any time; it is a national calamity that he should have been taken away from us at a time when his country stood so much in need of his sober counsel and wise guidance.

DEATH OF LORD RIPON

Last but not the least do we mourn the loss of the greatest and most beloved Viceroy whom India has known, —I need hardly name the noble Marquis of Ripon. Lord Ripon was loved and respected by educated Indians as I believe no Englishman who has ever been connected with India, excepting the father of the Indian National Congress, Mr. Allan Octavian Hume, and Sir William Wedderburn has been loved and respected. Lord Ripon was loved because he inaugurated that noble scheme of Local Self-Government which, though it has never yet had a fair trial, was intended by his Lordship to train Indians for the very best form of government, namely, a government of the people by the people, which it has been the proudest privilege of Englishmen to establish in their own land and to teach all other civilised nations to adopt. He was loved because he made the most courageous attempt to act up to the spirit of the noble Proclamation of 1858, to obliterate race distinctions and to treat his Indian fellow-subjects as standing on a footing of equality with their European fellow-subjects. He was respected because he was a

Statesman, yet friend to truth, of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honour clear.

He was respected because he was a God-fearing man, and showed by his conduct in the exalted office he filled as Viceroy of India, that he believed in the truth of the teaching that righteousness exalteth a nation. He was loved because he was a type of the noblest of Englishmen who have an innate love of justice, and who wish to see the blessings of liberty which they themselves enjoy extended

to all their fellow-men. Educated Indians were deeply touched by the last instance of his Lordship's desire to befriend the people of India when he went down to the House of Lords from his bed of illness in the closing days of his life, to support Lord Morley's noble scheme of Reform and to bid the noble lords who were opposing some of its beneficent provisions to be just to the people of India. It is a matter of profound grief that such a noble Englishman is no more. And yet the Marquis of Ripon lives, and will ever live in the grateful memory of generations of Indians yet to come. (*Cheers.*)

Truly has the poet said :—

But strew his ashes to the wind
Whose voice or sword has served mankind,
And is he dead whose noble mind
Lifts thine on high ?
To live in minds we leave behind
Is not to die. (*Cheers.*)

Ladies and Gentlemen, among the many subjects of importance which have occupied attention during the year, the foremost place must be given to the Regulations which have been promulgated under the scheme of Constitutional Reform for which the country is indebted to Lord Morley and to Lord Minto. That scheme was published a few days before the Congress met last year in Madras. It was hailed throughout the country with deep gratitude and delight. And nowhere did this feeling find warmer expression than at the Congress. The Regulations, on the other hand, which were published nearly five weeks ago have, I am sorry to say, created widespread disappointment and dissatisfaction, except in the limited circle of a section of our Moslem friends. The fact is, of course, deplorable. But no good will be gained and much evil is likely to result from ignoring or belittling it, or by trying to throw the blame for it on wrong shoulders. The interests of the country and of good government will be best served by trying to understand and to explain the reason for this great change which twelve months have brought about in the attitude of the educated Indians. The question is, are

they to blame for not hailing the Regulations with the same feelings of thankfulness and satisfaction with which they welcomed the main outlines of the scheme, or have the Regulations so far deviated from the liberal spirit of Lord Morley's despatch as to give the educated classes just cause for dissatisfaction? To obtain a full and satisfactory answer to this question, it is necessary to recall to mind the history of these reforms. And this I propose to do as briefly as I can.

Ladies and Gentlemen, it was the educated class in India who first felt the desire for the introduction of Self-Government—the government of the people through the elected representatives of the people—in India. This desire was the direct outcome of the study of that noble literature of England which is instinct with the love of freedom and eloquent of the truth that Self-Government is the best form of government. To my honoured friend, Babu Surendranath Banerjee, whom we are so pleased to find here to-day, growing older and older in years but yet full of the enthusiasm of youth for the service of the Motherland,—to Babu Surendranath will ever belong the credit of having been among the very first of Indians who gave audible expression to that desire. (*Cheers.*) It was he and our dear departed brother Mr. Ananda Mohan Bose who established the Indian Association of Calcutta in 1876, with the object, among others, of agitating for the introduction of a system of representative government in India. This desire was greatly strengthened by the deplorable acts of omission and commission of Lord Lytton's administration, to which, by the way, the administration of Lord Curzon bore in many respects a striking family resemblance. The discontent that prevailed in India towards the end of Lord Lytton's Viceroyalty was but slightly exceeded by that which prevailed at the close of Lord Curzon's regime. The overthrow of the Conservative ministry and the great Liberal victory of 1880 was consequently hailed with joy by educated Indians, as they read in it an assurance of relief from the effects of Lord Lytton's maladministration

and a promise of the introduction of liberal measures in India. Public expression was given to this feeling at a great meeting held in Calcutta at which, in the course of an eloquent speech, our friend Babu Surendranath uttered the following pregnant words :

The question of representative government looms not in the far-off distance. Educated India is beginning to feel that the time has come when some measure of Self-Government might be conceded to the people. Canada governs itself. Australia governs itself. And surely it is anomalous that the grandest dependency of England should continue to be governed upon wholly different principles. The great question of representative government will probably have to be settled by the Liberal Party, and I am sure it will be settled by them in a way which will add to the credit and honour of that illustrious party and will be worthy of their noble traditions.

This feeling was not confined to Bengal. About the same time a remarkable paper was published in my own Province, the then N.-W. Provinces, by the late Pandit Lakshmi Narayan Dar in which he strongly advocated the introduction of representative government in India. The Liberal Party did not disappoint India, and it could not, as it was then under the noble guidance of that greatest Englishman of his age, William Ewart Gladstone, who was one of the greatest apostles of liberty that the world has known. Mr. Gladstone never rendered a greater service to this country than when he sent out Lord Ripon as Viceroy and Governor-General of India. (*Cheers.*) His Lordship's advent at the end of Lord Lytton's Viceroyalty proved like the return of a bright day after a dark and chilly night. His benign influence was soon felt. Discontent died out, and a new hope, a new joy soon pervaded the land. India rejoiced to find that her destinies were entrusted to the care of a Viceroy who regarded her children as his equal fellow-subjects and was righteously determined to deal with them in the spirit of Queen Victoria's gracious Proclamation of 1858. Lord Ripon studied the wants and requirements of India. It is not unreasonable to suppose that his Lordship had taken note of the desire of educated Indians for the introduction of the principle of Self-Government in India, holding

evidently with Macaulay and a whole race of liberal-minded Englishmen that "no nation can be perfectly well governed till it is competent to govern itself." Lord Ripon inaugurated his noble scheme of Local Self-Government, not primarily as he was careful to point out in his Resolution, with a view to any immediate improvement in administration, but chiefly "as an instrument of political and popular education" which was to lead in course of time to Self-Government in the administration of the provinces and eventually of the whole of the Indian Empire. Lord Ripon also tried to disregard distinctions of race, colour and creed and appointed Indians to some of the highest posts in the country. His measures were intensely disliked by a large body of Europeans and Anglo-Indians, official and non-official. And when he endeavoured subsequently, by means of what is known as the Ilbert Bill, to place Indians and Europeans on a footing of equality in the eye of the law, the storm of opposition which had long been brewing in Anglo-India burst against him in full force. It was not an opposition to the Ilbert Bill alone, but, as his Lordship himself told Mr. Stead not long ago, to the scheme of Local Self-Government and to his whole policy of treating Indians and Europeans as equal fellow-subjects. Barring, of course, honourable exceptions, our European and Anglo-Indian fellow-subjects arrayed themselves in a body not against Hindus alone, not yet against the educated classes alone, but against Hindus, Mahomedans, Christians, Parsis, and all Indians alike, making no exception in favour of either the Mahomedans or the landed aristocracy. It was the educated class then, who organised the Indian National Congress with a view to protect and promote, not the interests of any class or creed, but the common interests of all Indians irrespective of any consideration of race, creed or colour. Not the worst enemy of the Congress can point to even a single Resolution passed by it which is opposed to this basic principle of its existence, to this guiding motive of its action. (*Hear, hear.*) Indeed no such Resolution could be passed by it as the eradication of all possible race, creed or provincial prejudices and the development and consolidation

of a sentiment of national unity among all sections of the Indian people was one of the essential features of the programme of the Congress. This Congress of educated Indians put forward a Reform of the Legislative Councils in the forefront of its programme, because it was not only good in itself but it has the additional virtue, as the late Mr. Yule happily put it, of being the best of all instruments for obtaining other Reforms that further experience and our growing wants might lead us to desire. It respectfully drew the attention of the Government to the poverty of vast numbers of the population and urged that the introduction of representative institutions would prove one of the most important practical steps towards the amelioration of their condition. The Congress also pressed for many other Reforms, among them being the employment of Indians in the higher branches of the public services and the holding of simultaneous examinations in India and England to facilitate the admission of Indians into the Indian Civil Service. Instead of welcoming the Congress as a most useful and loyal helpmate to Government, the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy unfortunately regarded it as hostile to Government. The Anglo-Indian Press, with some honourable exceptions, railed at it as if its object was to overthrow the British Government. Owing to this hostility of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy and of the Anglo-Indian Press, which is generally regarded as the mouthpiece of that bureaucracy, the bulk of our Mahomedan fellow-subjects held themselves aloof from the Congress—I say the bulk, because we have always had the benefit of the co-operation of a number of patriotic men from amongst them. And for fear of offending the same body of Anglo-Indian officials, the landed aristocracy also as a body kept itself at a safe distance from the Congress.

It is sad to recall that as the Congress continued to grow in strength and influence, some of our Mahomedan fellow-subjects of the Aligarh School and some members of the landed aristocracy came forward openly to oppose it. Notwithstanding however, all the opposition of the Anglo-

Indian Press and of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy, notwithstanding also the opposition of our Mahomedan fellow-subjects and the indifference of the landed aristocracy, the educated middle class continued to carry on the good work they had begun. They soon found a powerful champion in the late Mr. Bradlaugh, and achieved the first victory of the Congress when, as the direct result of its agitation, the Indian Councils Act was passed in 1892 and the Legislative Councils were reformed and expanded. (*Cheers.*) The attitude of the bureaucracy towards the educated class did not, however, show any change for the better. In fact, their dislike of them seemed to grow as they continued to agitate for further Reforms. And lest they might displease the officials, our Mahomedan fellow-subjects, as a body, continued to hold themselves aloof from the Congress and never asked for any Reform in the constitution of the Government. So also the landed classes. The educated middle class, the men of intellect, character and public spirit, who devoted their time to the study of public questions and their energies to the promotion of public good, felt, however, that the Reforms which had been effected under the Act of 1892 still left them without any real voice in the administration of their country. They found that administration was not being conducted in the best interests of the people of the country; they found that it continued to be conducted on extravagantly costly lines; they found that the level of taxation was maintained much higher than was necessary for the purposes of good administration; they found that the Military expenditure of the Government was far beyond the capacity of the country to bear, and they were alarmed that there was a heavy and continuous increase going on year after year in that expenditure; they found that an excessively large portion of the revenues raised from the people was being spent on what we may call Imperial purposes and a very inadequate portion on purposes which directly benefit the people, such as the promotion of general, scientific, agricultural, industrial and technical education, the provision of medical relief and sanitation; they found that the most earnest and well-reasoned representations of the Congress fell flat upon the

ears of the bureaucracy which was in power; and the conviction grew in them that their country could never be well or justly governed until the scheme of constitutional Reform which the Congress had suggested at its very first session was carried out in its entirety. (*Hear, hear.*)

At this stage came Lord Curzon to India. On almost every question of importance he adopted a policy the very reverse of that for which educated Indians had for years been praying. He showed unmistakable hostility to the educated class in India, and he is responsible for having greatly fostered it among some of his countrymen whom he has left behind in power. His attempt to lightly explain away the pledges solemnly given by the Sovereign and Parliament in the Proclamation of 1858 and in the Act of 1833, his officialising Universities Act, his overt attack upon Local Self-Government, and last, but not the least, his high-handed Partition of Bengal in the teeth of the opposition of the people of that province, filled the cup of discontent to the brim, and deepened the conviction in the minds of educated men that India could never be well or justly governed, nor could her people be prosperous or contented until they obtained through their representatives a real and potential voice in the administration of their affairs.

The conviction found the clearest and most emphatic expression in the Congress which met in Calcutta in 1906. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the revered patriarch of the educated community (*cheers*), speaking with the knowledge and experience born of a lifelong study of the defects and shortcomings of the existing system of administration and oppressed with the thought of the political and economic evils from which India has been suffering, declared in words of burning conviction that "Self-Government is the only and chief remedy. In Self-Government lies our hope, strength and greatness". Mr. Dadabhai did not urge that full-fledged representative institutions should at once be introduced into India. But he did urge, and the whole of educated India urged through him, that it was high time that a good beginning were made—"such a systematic

beginning as that it may naturally in no long time develop itself into full legislatures of Self-Government like those of the self-governing colonies." (*Hear, hear.*)

Happily for India, just as has happened at the end of Lord Lytton's administration, there was a change at the close of Lord Curzon's reign, of the ministry in England and the Liberal Government came into power. The faith of a large body of educated Indians in the efficacy of constitutional agitation had been undermined by the failure of all the efforts of the people of Bengal, made by prayer and petition, to avert the evil of the partition. But Mr. John Morley, who had long been admired and adored by educated Indians as a great lover of liberty and justice happily became Secretary of State for India and the hearts of educated Indians began to beat with the hope that their agitation for a real measure of Self-Government might succeed during the period of his office. Our esteemed brother Mr. Gokhale was appointed its trusted delegate to England by the Congress which met at Benares and over which he so worthily presided, to urge the more pressing proposals of Reform on the attention of the authorities there. What excellent work our friend did in England, how he pressed the urgent necessity and the entire reasonableness of the Reforms suggested by the Congress and prepared the minds of the men in power there to give a favourable consideration to our proposals, it is not for me here to tell. In the meantime, Gentlemen, our liberal minded Viceroy, Lord Minto, who found himself face to face with the legacy of a deep and widespread discontent which his brilliant but unwise predecessor had left to him, had taken a statesmanlike note of the signs of the times and the needs of the country, and had appointed a Committee of his Council to consider and report what changes should be introduced in the existing system of administration to make it suitable to altered conditions.

Ladies and Gentlemen, up to this time, up to the beginning of October 1906, our Mahomedan fellow-subjects did not trouble themselves with any questions of Reforms in the system of administration. But there were some

members of the Indian bureaucracy who were troubled with the thought that the liberal-minded Viceroy seriously contemplated important constitutional changes in that system, and they knew that the statesman who was at the helm of Indian affairs in England was the high priest of liberalism. They saw that there was every danger, from their point of view, that the prayer of the educated class for the Reform and expansion of the Legislative Councils on a liberal basis, might be granted. They frankly did not like it. And it was at this time that our Mahomedan fellow-subjects of the Aligarh School were roused from their apathy and indifference. They suddenly developed an interest—and an excessive interest too—in politics. A Mahomedan deputation was soon got up and waited on Lord Minto ! It claimed that Mahomedans were politically a more important community than other communities in India, and that they were therefore entitled to special consideration and even preferential treatment. I regret to say it, Gentlemen, but it is my duty to say it, that the concession which His Excellency the Viceroy was persuaded to make to this utterly unjustifiable claim in his reply to that deputation, has been the root of much of the trouble which has arisen in connection with these reforms. The bureaucracy had, however, gained a point. The proposals for Reform which were formulated in the letter of Sir Harold Stuart, dated 24th August 1907, gave abundant evidence of the bias of that body, against those who had agitated for Reform. The proposals for the special representation of Mahomedans contained in it, tended clearly to set one religion against another and to counterpoise the influence of the educated middle class. The proposals for the special representation of landholders who had never asked to be treated as a separate class, also had their origin evidently in the same kind of feeling. So also the proposals for creating Imperial and Provincial Advisory Councils. Those proposals met with a general condemnation from thoughtful men all over the country, excepting, of course, some among the landholders and the Mahomedans. They could not meet with a welcome because they did not deserve it. (*Hear, hear.*)

• Later on the Government of India revised their provisional scheme in the light of the criticisms passed upon it, and with some important modifications submitted it to the Secretary of State for India. Lord Morley did not share the bias of the bureaucracy against the educated class,—it would have been as strange as sad if he did. He recognised that they were an important factor, if not the most important factor, who deserved consideration. In his speech on the Indian Budget in 1907, his Lordship observed: "You often hear men talk of the educated section of India as a mere handful, an infinitesimal fraction. So they are in numbers. But it is idle—totally idle—to say that this infinitesimal fraction does not count. This educated section makes all the difference, is making and will make all the difference." His Lordship appointed a Committee of his own Council to consider the scheme which the Government of India had submitted to him, and after receiving its report framed his own proposals which were published in the now famous Despatch of the 27th November, 1908. His Lordship had, indeed, accepted the substantial part of His Excellency the Viceroy's scheme, but he had liberalised it by the important changes he had made in it into a practically new scheme. The proposals for the Imperial and Advisory Councils which had been condemned by educated India were brushed ceremoniously aside. The Provincial Legislative Councils were to have a majority of non-official members, who were to be, with very few exceptions, elected and not nominated members. His Lordship had already appointed two distinguished Indians as members of his own Council. Indians were now to be appointed to the Executive Council of the Governor-General of India and of the Governors of Madras and Bombay. Similar Executive Councils were to be established, with one or more Indian members in them, in the other large provinces, which were still ruled by Lieutenant-Governors. Under a scheme of Decentralisation, Municipal and District Boards were to be vested with increased powers and responsibilities and to be freed from official control. The cause of Local Self-Government was to receive an effectual advance. Its roots

•

were to be extended deep down into the villages. Taking full note of the various interests for which representation had to be provided in the enlarged Councils, Lord Morley suggested a scheme of electoral colleges which, as was rightly claimed, was as simple as any scheme for the representation of minorities can be. It was built up on a system of a single vote, and fully avoided the evils of double and plural voting. It was equally free from the other objection to which the original proposals were open, *viz.*, that they would set one class against another. It gave the power to each section of the population to return a member in the proportion corresponding to its own proportion to the total population. This scheme, as we all know, was received throughout the country with feelings of great gratitude and gratification. An influential deputation composed of the representatives of all classes of the people waited upon His Excellency the Viceroy to personally tender their thanks for it to him, and through him, to Lord Morley. Did the educated class lack behind any other classes in welcoming the scheme? Did the feelings of grateful satisfaction find a warmer expression anywhere than in the speech of my honoured predecessor in office, who speaking in reference to it exclaimed that "the time of the singing of birds is come and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land"? The Congress unanimously passed a Resolution giving expression to the deep and general satisfaction with which the Reform proposals formulated in Lord Morley's despatch had been received throughout the country, and it tendered its most sincere and grateful thanks to his Lordship and to Lord Minto for those proposals. It expressed the confident hope at the same time that the details of the proposed scheme would be worked out in the same liberal spirit in which its main outlines had been conceived. This unfortunately has not been done, and a very important part of the scheme has been so modified as to give just grounds of complaint in a large portion of the country.

INDIANS IN EXECUTIVE COUNCILS

Now, Gentlemen, the feature of the Reforms which most appealed to the minds of educated Indians was the proposal to appoint Indians to the Executive Councils of the Governor-General of India and of the Governors of Madras and Bombay, and the proposal to create similar Councils in the other large provinces of India, which were placed under Lieutenant-Governors. The most unmistakable proof of this fact was found in the thrill of grateful satisfaction which passed all over the country when the announcement was made of the appointment of Mr. Satyendra Prasanna Sinha as a member of the Viceroy's Council. And I take this opportunity of tendering our most cordial thanks for that appointment both to Lord Minto and to Lord Morley. (*Cheers.*) That appointment has afforded the best proof of the desire of both their Lordships to obliterate distinctions of race, creed and colour, and to admit Indians to the highest offices under the Crown for which they may be qualified, and it has been most sincerely and warmly appreciated as such by thoughtful Indians throughout the country. Our friends in Bombay and Madras will soon have the satisfaction of finding an Indian appointed to the Executive Councils of the Governors of their respective provinces. And thanks to the large hearted and liberal support given to the proposal by Sir Edward Baker, our brethren in Bengal too, will shortly have the satisfaction of seeing an Executive Council established in their province with an Indian as one of its members. But, Gentlemen, the people of my own provinces—the United Provinces, and of the Punjab, of Eastern Bengal and Assam, and of Burma, have been kept out of the benefit of the undoubted advantages which would result by the judgment of the Lieutenant-Governor being “fortified and enlarged” in the weighty words of Lord Morley’s despatch, “by two or more competent advisers, with an official and responsible share in his deliberations”. We in the United Provinces had looked eagerly forward to having an Executive Council created there at the same time that one would be established in Bengal. Hindus

and Mahomedans, the landed aristocracy and the educated classes were unanimous in their desire to see such Councils established. Bombay with a population of only 19 millions, Madras with population of only 38 millions have each long enjoyed the advantage of being governed by a Governor in Council. The United Provinces which have a population of 48 millions, have been ruled all these many years and must yet continue to be ruled by a Lieutenant-Governor! Bengal, the population of which exceeds the population of the United Provinces by barely 3 millions, will have the benefit of an Executive Council. Not so the United Provinces; nor yet Eastern Bengal and Assam which have a population of 31 millions, nor the Punjab which has a population somewhat larger than that of the Presidency of Bombay! This is clearly unjust, and the injustice of it has nowhere been more keenly felt than in my own Provinces.

PROVINCIAL EXECUTIVE COUNCILS

The people of the United Provinces have special reasons to feel aggrieved at this decision. So far back as 1833, Section 56 of the Charter Act of that year enacted that the Presidencies of Fort William in Bengal, Fort St. George, Bombay, and Agra shall be administered by a Governor and three Councillors. But this provision was suspended by an Act passed two years later mainly on the ground that "the same would be attended with a large increase of charge". The Act provided that during such time as the execution of the Act of 1833 should remain suspended, it would be lawful for the Governor-General of India in Council to appoint any servant of the East India Company of ten years' standing to the office of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces. When the Charter Act of 1853 was passed, it still contemplated the creation of the Presidency of Agra under the Act of 1833. Those enactments have never been repealed. In the long period that has elapsed since 1833, the provinces have largely grown in size and population by the annexation of Oudh and the normal growth of population. The revenues of the provinces have also largely increased.

If the objection that the creation of an Executive Council would be attended with a large increase of charge was at any time a valid one, it has long ceased to be so. The provinces are not so poor that they cannot afford to bear the small increase in expenditure which the new arrangement will involve. They have for years been making larger contributions to the Imperial Exchequer than the sister Provinces of Bombay, Madras and Bengal. On the other hand, the arguments for the creation of such a Council have been growing stronger and stronger every year. The question was taken up by the Government of India in 1867-68. but unfortunately the discussion did not lead to any change in the system. The eminent author of *Indian Polity*, whose views on questions of Indian administration are entitled to great respect, strongly urged the introduction of the change fifteen years ago. Wrote General Chesney :

In regard to administration, the change (the North-Western Provinces) is as important as Bengal. It comprises 49 districts as against 47 in the latter, nearly twice as many as in Bombay, and more than thrice the number of districts in Madras, and every consideration which makes for styling the head of the Bengal Government a Governor, applies equally to this great province. (This was said when Bengal had not been partitioned.) Here also, as in Bengal, the Governor should be aided by a Council. Sir George Chesney went on to say: The amount of business to be transacted here is beyond the capacity of a single administrator to deal with properly, while the province has arrived at a condition when the vigour and impulse to progress which the rule of one man can impart, may be fitly replaced by the greater continuity of policy which would be secured under the administration of a Governor aided by a Council. So far from the head of the administration losing by the change—not to mention the relief from the pressure of work now imposed on a single man, and that a great deal of business which has now to be disposed of in his name by irresponsible Secretaries would then fall to be dealt with by members of the Government with recognised authority—it would be of great advantage to the Governor if all appointments and promotions in the public service of this province, a much larger body than that in Madras and Bombay, were made in consultation with and on the joint responsibility of colleagues, instead of at his sole pleasure.

The work of administration has very much increased since this was written. And we have it now on the

unimpeachable testimony of the Royal Commission on Decentralisation, who submitted their report early this year, that "with the development of the administration in all its branches, the growth of important industrial interests, the spread of education and political aspirations, and the growing tendency of the public to criticise the administration and to appeal to the highest Executive tribunals, the Lieutenant-Governors of the larger provinces are clearly over-burdened". Sir Antony MacDonnell who ruled over the United Provinces not many years ago, could not bear the strain of the work continuously for more than four years, and had to take six months' leave during the period of his Lieutenant-Governorship. The present Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces also has, I regret to learn, found it necessary to take six months' leave at the end of only three years of his administration. And we have been surprised and grieved to learn that both Lord MacDonnell and Sir John Hewett have opposed the creation of an Executive Council for the United Provinces. The Decentralisation Commission did not, however, rest the case for a change in the existing system on the sole ground that the head of the province was over-burdened with work. They rested it on a much higher ground. They rightly urged that "even if a Lieutenant-Governor could dispose of all the work demanding consideration at the hands of a Provincial Government, we think that such powers are too wide to be expediently entrusted to one man, however able or zealous". And they unanimously recommended the establishment in the larger provinces of India, of a regular Council Government such as obtains in Bombay and Madras, improved with the addition of an Indian member to them. Lord Morley was pleased to accept this recommendation with the important modification that the head of the Provinces should continue to be a member of the Indian Civil Service; and though we did not approve of this modification, we were content and thankful that a Council Government should be introduced even in this modified form. But even that has been withheld from us, and the

high hopes that had been raised have naturally given place to a correspondingly deep disappointment. There is a widespread belief in my Provinces that if our Lieutenant-Governor had not been opposed to the proposal in question, the Provinces would have had an Executive Council just as Bengal will soon have. And the fact has furnished a striking instance of the disadvantages of leaving vital questions which affect the well-being of 48 millions of people to be decided by the judgment of a single individual, however able and well-meaning he may be. (*Hear, hear.*)

Gentlemen, this is not a mere sentimental grievance with us. We find that the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay which have had the benefit of being governed by a Governor-in-Council have made far greater progress in every matter which affects the happiness of the people than my own Provinces. And a conviction has gained ground in the minds of all thoughtful men that the Provinces will have no chance of coming abreast even of Bombay and Madras until they have a Government similar to that of those Provinces, so that there may be a reasonable continuity of policy in the administration and the proposals of the Provincial Government may receive greater consideration than they do at present from the Government of India and the Secretary of State. Gentlemen, the noble lords and the members of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy—both those who have retired and those who are still in service, who opposed the creation of an Executive Council for the United Provinces—have, I regret to say, done a great dis-service to the cause of good government by opposing this important portion of the scheme of Reform. That opposition has caused deep dissatisfaction among the educated classes and has greatly chilled the enthusiasm which was aroused among them when the proposals of Lord Morley were first published. I would strongly urge upon the Government the wisdom of taking steps to give an Executive Council at as early a date as may be practicable, not only to United Provinces but also to the Punjab, to Eastern Bengal and Assam, and

to Burma. The creation of such Councils with one or two Indian members in them will be a distinct gain to the cause of good administration. It will afford an effectual safeguard against serious administrative blunders being committed, particularly in these days of repressive measures and deportations without trial. England is just now on the eve of a general election. But the elections will soon be over. Let us hope for the good of this country that it will result in bringing the Liberal Government again into power. Let us hope that in the result the House of Lords will become somewhat liberal. Let us hope that soon after Parliament has been constituted again, the Secretary of State for India, who, let us also hope, will be Lord Morley again, and the Governor-General of India in Council will be pleased to take the earliest opportunity to create Executive Councils in the United Provinces, the Punjab, and Eastern Bengal and Assam, by either getting the Indian Councils Act modified, or by obtaining the assent of both the Houses of Parliament to the creation of such Councils under the provisions of the existing Act. (*Cheers.*)

Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to make it clear here that we have no complaint whatsoever in this connection either against Lord Morley or Lord Minto. We know—and we acknowledge it with sincere gratitude—that both the noble Lords did all that they could to get the original clause (3) of the Bill passed as it had been framed. We know that we owe our discomfiture to the action of Lord Curzon, who seems unfortunately for us to be afflicted with the desire of swelling the record of his ill services to India, and to the opposition of Lord MacDonnell, from whom we of the United Provinces had hoped for support to our cause, and lastly, to the regrettable attitude adopted towards the proposal contained in that clause by the present Lieutenant-Governor of our Provinces. I still venture to hope, however, that Sir John Hewett will be pleased to reconsider his position, particularly in view of the important fact that our sister Province of Bengal also is shortly going to have an Executive Council, and that his Honour will earn the lasting gratitude of the people over

whom Providence has placed him, and whose destinies it is in his power to mar or make, by moving the Government of India to take early steps to secure to them the benefit of Government by a Council before he retires from his exalted office. (*Cheers.*)

THE REGULATIONS

Gentlemen, the question of the creation of Executive Councils affects, however, only particular provinces of India, but the Regulations that have been promulgated under the scheme of Reform have given rise to even more widespread and general dissatisfaction. I will therefore now ask you to turn your attention to these Regulations. We all remember that Lord Morley had put forward a most carefully considered scheme of proportional representation on the basis of population. We therefore regretted to find that, in the debate which took place on the Bill, his Lordship accepted the view that the Mahomedan community was entitled on the ground of the political importance which it claimed, to a large representation than would be justified by its proportion to the total population. His Lordship was pleased, however, to indicate the extent of the large representation which he was prepared to ensure to the Mahomedans after taking into account even their alleged political importance; and though the educated non-Moslem public generally, and many far-seeing men among our Mahomedan fellow-subjects also, were, and still are opposed to any representation in the Legislatures of the country on the basis of religion, yet there were several amongst us who recognised the difficulty that had been created by Lord Minto's reply to the Mahomedan deputation at Simla, and were prepared not to demur to the larger representation of Mahomedans to the extent suggested by Lord Morley. We were prepared to agree that a certain amount of representation should be granted to them; that they should try to secure it through the general electorates, and that if they failed to obtain the number of representatives fixed for them, they should be allowed to make up the number by election by special Mahomedan electorates formed for the purpose. The Regulations which

have been published, however, not only provide that they shall elect the number of representatives which has been fixed for them on a consideration not only of their proportion to the total population but also of their alleged political importance, by special electorates created for the purpose, but they also permit them to take part in elections by mixed electorates, and thereby enable them to secure an excessive and undue representation of their particular community to the exclusion to a corresponding extent of the representatives of other communities. The system of single votes which was an essential feature of Lord Morley's scheme has been cast to the winds; the injustice of double and plural voting which Lord Morley tried to avoid has been given the fullest play. In my provinces, and I believe in other provinces also, some of my Mahomedan fellow-subjects have voted in three places. So long as there was still a chance of getting the Government to increase the number of seats which were to be specially reserved to them, our astute friends of the Moslem League swore that none of them would seek an election to the Councils by the votes of non-Moslems. When the Regulations were passed, they lost no time in cancelling the Resolution of their League, and put forward candidates to contest every seat for which elections were to be made by mixed electorates. Members of Municipal and District Boards to whom the general franchise has been confined were elected or appointed at a time when the Moslem League had not preached the gospel of separation. The electors did not then accept or reject a candidate on the ground of his religion. Mahomedans, therefore, filled a far larger number of seats on Municipal and District Boards than their proportion to the total population or their stake in the country would entitle them to hold. The result has been that in addition to the four seats specially reserved to the Mahomedans, they have won two more seats in the United Provinces in the general elections, and these with the nominations made by the Government have given them eight seats out of a total of 26 non-official seats in the legislature of the Province, where they form but one-sixth of the population!

This is protecting the interests of a minority with a vengeance. It looks more like a case of allowing the majority to be driven to a corner by a minority. What makes the matter worse, however, is that this advantage has been reserved only to the favoured minority of our Mahomedan fellow-subjects. No such protection has been extended to the Hindu minorities in the Punjab and Eastern Bengal and Assam. The Hindu minorities in the said two provinces have been left out severely in the cold. And yet they are found fault with for not waxing warm with enthusiasm over the Reforms! (*Hear, hear.*)

Gentlemen, let us now turn to the question of the franchise. Direct representation has been given to Mahomedans. It has been refused to non-Mahomedans. All Mahomedans who pay an income-tax on an income of three thousand rupees or land revenue in the same sum, and all Mahomedan graduates of five years' standing, have been given the power to vote. Now I am not only not sorry but am sincerely glad that direct representation has been given to our Mahomedan fellow-subjects and that the franchise extended to them is fairly liberal. Indeed, no taxation without representation being the cardinal article of faith in the political creed of Englishmen, it would have been a matter for greater satisfaction if the franchise had been extended to all payers of income-tax. The point of our complaint is that the franchise has not similarly been extended to the non-Mahomedan subjects of His Majesty. A Parsi, Hindu or Christian who may be paying an income-tax on three lakhs or land revenue in the sum of three times three lakhs a year, is not entitled to a vote, to which his Mahomedan fellow-subject, who pays an income-tax on only three thousand a year or land revenue in the same sum, is entitled! Hindu, Parsi and Christian graduates of thirty years' standing, men like Sir Gurudas Banerji, Dr. Bhandarkar, Sir Subramania Iyer and Dr. Rash Behari Ghose have not been given a vote, which has been given to every Mahomedan graduate of five years' standing! People whose sensitiveness has been too much spared

down by age may not resent this. But can it be doubted for a moment that tens of thousands of non-Mahomedan graduates in the country deeply resent being kept out of a privilege which has been extended to Mahomedan graduates? It is to my mind exceedingly deplorable that when the Government decided to give direct representation and a fairly liberal franchise to Mahomedans, it did not also decide to extend them to non-Mahomedans as well.

Let us next consider the restrictions that have been placed on the choice of electors in choosing candidates. In the Regulations for Bombay and Madras, and in those for Bengal also, eligibility to a membership of a Provincial Council has been confined to members of Municipal and District Boards only. This is a novel departure from the practice which obtained for the last seventeen years under the Indian Councils Act of 1892, and I regret to think that it is a departure taken without a full consideration of its result. The result is most unfortunate. It is acknowledged that the scheme of Local Self-Government which Lord Ripon introduced into the country has not yet had a fair trial. Lord Morley in his despatch of last year took note of the fact that the expectations formed of it had not been realised, and in explanation thereof his Lordship was pleased to say, adopting the language of the Resolution of 1882, that "there appears to be great force in the argument that so long as the chief Executive officers are, as a matter of course, Chairmen of Municipal and District Committees, there is little chance of those Committees affording any effective training to their members in the management of local affairs or of the non-official members taking any real interest in local business". Further on, his Lordship truly observed that "non-official members have not been induced to such an extent as was hoped to take real interest in local business, because their powers and their responsibilities were not real". Owing to this fact Municipal and District Boards have, with a few exceptions here and there, not attracted many able and independent members. The result of confining eligibility as a member of Council to members of Municipal and

District Boards has, therefore, necessarily been to exclude a number of men of light and leading in every province—excepting in my own where, I am thankful to say, no such restriction has been made—from being eligible for election. Under the operation of this short-visioned rule in Bengal, a number of the public men of the province were found to be ineligible for election; and Sir Edward Baker had to modify the Regulations within barely three weeks of their having been published, to make it possible for some at least of the public men of his province to enter the Provincial Council. In Madras, Sir Arthur Lawley had to resort to the expedient of nominating some of the ex-members of the Legislative Council, as members of Municipal and District or Taluq Boards in order to make them eligible as members of the Provincial Council under the new Regulations. In Bombay, two ex-members of the Council had to enter Municipal Boards, which they were only enabled to do by the courtesy of obliging friends who resigned their seats to make room for them, in order to qualify themselves for election to the Council.

This does not, I regret to say, exhaust the grounds of our objections to the Regulations. A property qualification has for the first time been laid down in the case of candidates for membership of the Provincial Councils. No such qualification is required of Members of Parliament in England. None such was required in India under the Regulations which were in force for nearly seventeen years under the Indian Councils Act of 1892. No complaint was ever made that the absence of any such restriction on the choice of the electors had led to the admission of any undesirable person into any of the Councils. The possession of property or an income does not necessarily predicate ability, much less character and does not by itself, secure to any man the esteem or confidence of his fellow-men. No more does the absence of property necessarily indicate want of capability to acquire it. It certainly does not indicate want of respectability. The ancient law-giver, Manu, mentions five qualifications which earn for a man the respect of others. Says he :

"Wealth, relations, age, good deeds and learning are the five titles to respect; of these each succeeding qualification is of greater weight than each preceding one."

According to this time-honoured teaching, education is the highest qualification and the possession of wealth the lowest. The Regulations have not merely reversed the order but have excluded education from the category of qualifications required to make a man eligible as a member of the Legislative Councils! The framers of the Regulation have taken no note of the fact that in this ancient land thousands of men of bright intelligence and pure character have voluntarily wedded themselves to poverty and consecrated their lives to the pursuit or promotion of learning or religion or other philanthropic object. The result is that so far as the Provincial Councils are concerned, in several provinces selfless patriots like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji or Mr. Gokhale would not be eligible as members of those Councils. Regulations which lead to such results stand self-condemned. (*Cheers.*)

Again, the clause resulting to disqualifications for membership has been made unnecessarily stringent and exclusive. A person who has been dismissed from Government service is to be disqualified for ever for a membership of the Councils. Whether he was dismissed for anything which indicated any hostility to Government or any moral turpitude, or whether he was dismissed merely for disobeying or not carrying out any tuncpery order, or merely for failing to attend at a place and time when or at which he might have been required, he must never be permitted to serve the Government and the people again even in an honorary capacity! It does not matter whether his case was rightly or wrongly decided, his having been dismissed constitutes an offence of such gravity that it cannot be condoned. So also does a sentence of imprisonment however short it may be, for any offence which is punishable with imprisonment for more than six months. Here again, no account is taken of the fact whether the offence for which the punishment was inflicted, implied

any moral defect in the man. No such disqualification exists in the case of a membership of Parliament. Mr. John Burns was once sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment; he is now a Cabinet Minister. (*Hear, hear.*) Mr. Lynch actually fought against the British Government in the Boer War; he was sentenced to death, but the sentence was mitigated later on, and eventually entirely commuted, and he has since been elected a Member of Parliament. What then can be the reason or justification for laying down such a severe and sweeping disqualification in a country where the judicial and executive functions are still combined in one officer, and where the administration of justice is not as impartial and pure as it is in England?

More objectionable still is clause (i) of the disqualifying section which lays down that a man shall not be eligible as a member of the Council if he has been declared by the Local Government to be of such reputation and antecedents that his election would, in the opinion of the head of the Local Government, be contrary to the public interest. Now, Gentlemen, you will remember that in the debates in Parliament the question was raised whether the deportation of a man under Regulation III of 1818 and similar Regulations would by itself disqualify him for sitting in a Legislative Council. Bearing probably in mind that a man might be deported without any just or reasonable cause, as it is believed happened in the case of Lala Lajpat Rai, Lord Morley could not perhaps bring himself to agree to a deportation being by itself made a ground of disqualification. We may take it that his Lordship gave his assent to clause (i) being enacted in the belief that it was less open to objection. But with due respect to his Lordship, I venture to submit that this clause is open to even greater objection than the disqualification of deportees as such would have been. In the case of a deportation, the Local Government has to satisfy the Government of India why action should be taken under any of the drastic Regulations relating thereto. This new clause empowers the Local Government on its own,

authority to declare a man to be ineligible, and thereby to do irreparable injury to his character. The judgment of the Local Government may be entirely unjust, but there can be no appeal from it. How seriously liable to abuse this clause is, is demonstrated by the case of Mr. Kelkar, editor of the *Mahratta*. Mr. Kelkar offered himself as a candidate for election to the Bombay Council. Thereupon His Excellency the Governor of Bombay made a declaration under the clause in question that in His Excellency's opinion Mr. Kelkar's reputation and antecedents were such that his election would be contrary to the public interest. Now, Gentlemen, the knowledge which His Excellency the Governor has of Mr. Kelkar's reputation and antecedents, is presumably not his own personal knowledge, but must have largely been derived from reports. There happens to be another man, however, in the Bombay Presidency, aye, in Poona itself, where Mr. Kelkar has lived and worked, whose solicitude for the public interest is, it will perhaps be conceded, not less keen, and whose opinion, as to what would be contrary to the public interest, is not entitled to less weight than that of even Sir George Clarke or his colleagues, and that is my esteemed brother Mr. Gokhale. He has one great advantage in this respect over Sir George Clarke, that he has a personal knowledge, born of many years of personal contact in public work, of Mr. Kelkar's character. When the declaration in question was made, Mr. Gokhale felt it to be his duty to protest against the action of the Governor of Bombay and to publicly bear testimony to the good character of Mr. Kelkar. Mr. Kelkar appealed to the Governor, but his appeal has been rejected, and he remains condemned unheard! (*Shame.*)

NON-OFFICIAL MAJORITIES

One of the most important features of the reforms which created wide-spread satisfaction was the promise of a non-official majority in the Provincial Councils. The Congress had, in the scheme which it put forward so far back as 1886, urged that at least half the members of both the Imperial and Provincial Legislative Councils

should be elected and not more than one-fourth should be officials. Congressmen regarded this as the *sine qua non* for securing to the representatives of the people a real voice in the administration of their country's affairs. Lord Morley did not think it fit, however, to give us yet a non-official majority in the Imperial Legislative Council. We regretted the decision. But Lord Morley had been pleased to accept the recommendation for a non-official majority in the Provincial Legislative Council, and we decided to accept it with gratitude, in the confidence that after the Provincial Legislative Councils have worked satisfactorily for a few years under the new scheme, the more important concession of a non-official majority in the Imperial Council was certain to come.

We are glad and thankful to find that a real non-official majority has been provided in the case of Bengal. And I take this opportunity of expressing our high appreciation of the large-hearted and liberal support which Sir Edward Baker has given to Lord Morley's proposals of Reform. It is due to that support that Bengal will shortly have the advantage of a Council Government. To Sir Edward Baker alone, among all the Governors and Lieutenant-Governors of the different Provinces, belongs the credit of having secured a non-official majority of elected members in the Legislative Council of the great Province over which he rules. The Regulations for Bengal lay down that out of a total of 49 members of the Council 26, i.e., more than half shall be elected, and that the members nominated by the Lieutenant-Governor shall not exceed 22, not more than 17 of whom may be officials, and 2 of whom shall be non-officials to be elected one from the Indian commercial community and one from the planting community. But in sad contrast to this stands the case of the second largest province of India, *viz.*, the United Provinces. The provision for a non-official majority has there been reduced to a practical nullity. Sir John Hewett had warmly supported the proposals for the creation of Imperial and Provincial Advisory Councils. Those proposals, as we know, were rejected by the Secretary of

State for India. But His Honour seems to have been so much fascinated by them that he has done a good deal to make his Legislative Council approach the ideal of what were proposed to be Advisory Councils. (*Hear, hear.*) Out of the total number of 46 members of the Council, only 20 are to be elected, and 26 to be nominated, of whom as many as 20 may be officials. Sir John Hewett has nominated the maximum number of 20 official members, and His Honour has shown great promptitude in nominating 6 non-official members. Two of these are independent Chiefs, *viz.*, His Highness the Nawab of Rampur and His Highness the Raja of Tehri, and the third is His Highness the Maharaja of Benares who is practically regarded as an independent Chief. No subject of the British Government has any voice in the administration of the affairs of these Chiefs. What justification can there be then for giving them a voice in the discussion of any legislation or other public questions which affect the weal or woe of the subjects of the British Indian Government? I mean no disrespect to these Chiefs when I say that they do not study the wants of the latter. They cannot be expected to do so. And even when they have formed an opinion about any matter that may come up for discussion, they cannot always afford to express it, except when it should happen to coincide with that of the Government. (*Hear, hear.*) It is thus obvious that they cannot be useful members of the Council which they are to adorn. Why then have they been nominated, if it be not to act as a counterpoise to the influence of the educated class? Of the three other nominees of Sir John Hewett, one is a Mahomedan Nawab who is innocent of English and one a European indigo planter. The sixth nominee is a representative of the non-official Indian commercial community, which the Regulations required him to be, but he too is innocent of English!

Some of the other objections to which the Regulations are open have also been most forcibly illustrated in the case of my unlucky Province. Our Mahomedan fellow-subjects constitute only 14 per cent. of the popula-

tion there. But four seats have been allotted to them out of the total of 20 seats which are to be filled up by election in consideration of their proportion to the total population *plus* their alleged political importance. In addition to this they have been allowed to participate in the elections by mixed electorates and they have won two seats there. The Government has, besides, nominated two Mahomedans as non-official members. Thus out of 26 non-official members, 8 are Mahomedans. Among the elected members as many as 8 are representatives of the landed aristocracy and only 5 of the educated classes. The non-official majority has thus been reduced to a farce.

Time will not permit me to deal at length with the case of the other provinces. But I cannot pass over the case of the Punjab, the grievances of which are very real. Having regard to its position, its population, and the educational, social and industrial progress made by it, the number of members fixed for its Legislative Council is quite inadequate, and the number of elected members is extremely meagre, being only 5 in a total of 25. Besides this the franchise for the general electorates, through which alone the non-Moslem population can take any part in the election of any member for the Council, has been limited to an extremely small number of persons. The number of Municipalities in the Punjab is larger than in any other province of India. In more than one hundred of them, elected representatives of the people have been serving for a long time past. Yet the privilege of voting for the election of members of the Council, has, I regret to find, been confined to only nine of these bodies ! Can there be any justification for narrowing the franchise in this manner ? The people of the Punjab would seem to be entitled to as much consideration as the people of any other province in the Empire, and if a large number of members of Municipal and District Boards in other provinces were considered to be fit to exercise the franchise usefully and beneficially, the privilege should have been extended in at least an equal degree to the people of the Punjab. I do not wish to dwell upon the resentment which has been caused in the

province by its being so unjustly dealt with. I trust the Government will be pleased to consider whether the exclusion—on the face of it an unreasonable and unjustifiable exclusion—of vast numbers of educated men in a progressive province like the Punjab from a privilege which has been extended to their fellow-subjects in other parts of the country and even in their own province, is not quite a serious political blunder. (*Hear, hear.*) The allaying of discontent was one of the main objects of the scheme of Reform. I venture humbly to say that the way in which the Reform has been worked out here is certainly not calculated to achieve that end. Every consideration for the welfare of the people and of good administration seems to me to demand that as large a number of men of intelligence, education and influence as may be available should be given the right to exercise a constitutional privilege and thus invited to employ their time and energy in the service of their country.

Gentlemen, I will not detain you by dwelling on the defects of the Regulations for the other provinces. Speaking generally, we find that the Regulations have been vitiated by the disproportionate representation which they have secured to the Mahomedans and to the landed classes and the small room for representation which they have left for the educated classes; also by the fact that they have made an invidious and irritating distinction between Moslem and non-Moslem subjects of His Majesty, both in the matter of the protection of minorities and of the franchise, and lastly in that they have laid down unnecessarily narrow and arbitrary restrictions on the choice of electors.

Such are the Regulations which have been promulgated under the Reform scheme. I would respectfully invite Lord Morley himself to judge how very far they have departed from the liberal spirit of the proposals which he had fashioned with such statesmanlike care and caution. I also invite Lord Minto to consider if the Regulations do not practically give effect, as far as they could, to the objectionable features of the scheme which was put forward

in Sir Harold Stuart's letter of 24th August 1907, which were so widely condemned, and also to judge how different in spirit they are from the proposals for which the people of India tendered warmest thanks to his Lordship and to his noble chief at Whitehall. Is it at all a matter for wonder that the educated classes in India are intensely dissatisfied with the Regulations? Have they not every reason to be so? For more than a quarter of a century they have laboured earnestly and prayerfully through the Congress to promote the common interests of all classes and sects of the people, and to develop a common feeling of nationality among the followers of all the different religions in India, which is not less necessary for the purposes of a civilized Government than for the peaceful progress, prosperity and happiness of the people. The Regulations for the first time in the history of British rule have recognised religion as a basis of representation, and have thus raised a wall of separation between the Mahomedan and non-Mahomedan subjects of His Majesty which it will take years of earnest efforts to demolish. They have also practically undone, for the time being at any rate, the results of the earnest agitation of a quarter of a century to secure an effective voice to the elected representatives of the people in the government of their country. It is not that the Congress did not want, or does not want, that our Mahomedan fellow-subjects should be fairly and fully represented in the reformed Councils. It is firmly believed, and it is fully expected, that if a general electorate would be formed on a reasonable basis, a sufficient number of representatives of all classes of the community would naturally find their way into the Councils. But it is desired that as they would have to deal as members of the Councils, with questions which affect equally the interests of all classes and creeds, they should be returned to the Councils by the common suffrages of their countrymen of all classes and creeds, and that their title to the confidence of their countrymen should be based on their ability to protect and promote their interests by their education, integrity and independence of character, and not on the accident of their belonging to any particular

faith or creed, or of their having inherited or acquired a certain number of broad acres. (*Hear, hear.*) We are naturally grieved to find that when we had caught a glimpse of the promised land by the extremely fortunate combination of a liberal statesman as Secretary of State and a liberal-minded Viceroy, our old friends of the bureaucracy have yet succeeded in blocking the way to it for at least some time to come.

Gentlemen, the attitude of educated Indians towards the reforms has been misinterpreted in some quarters. Some of the criticisms has been quite friendly and I am sure we all fully appreciate it. But I wish that our friends looked a little more closely into the facts. Their criticism puts me in mind of a very instructive ancient story. Vishvamitra, a mighty Kshatriya king, the master of vast hordes of wealth and of extensive territories, felt that there was a still higher position for him to attain, *viz*, that of being a Brahman, whose title to respect rests not on any earthly possession or power but on learning and piety and devotion to philanthropic work. He accordingly practised saintly and severe austerities, and, with the exception of one Brahman, every one acclaimed him a Brahman. That one Brahman was Vasishtha. Vishvamitra first tried to persuade Vasishtha to declare him a Brahman; then he threatened him; and having yet failed in his object, he killed a hundred children of Vasishtha in order to coerce him into compliance with his desire. Deeply was Vasishtha distressed. If he had but once said that Vishvamitra had qualified himself to be regarded a Brahman, he would have saved himself and his hoary-headed wife and the rest of his family all the sorrow and suffering which Vishvamitra inflicted upon them. But Vasishtha had realised the truth of the ancient teaching. He valued truth more than a hundred sons. (*Hear, hear.*) He would not save them by uttering what he did not believe to be true. In his despair, Vishvamitra decided to kill Vasishtha himself. One evening he went armed to Vasishtha's hermitage with that object. But while he was waiting in a corner for an opportunity to carry out his evil intent, he

overheard what Vasishtha said to his wife, the holy Arundhati, in answer to a query as to whose *tapasya* shone as bright as the moonlight in the midst of which they were seated. "Vishvamitra's" was the unhesitating answer! The hearing of it changed Vishvamitra. He cast aside the arms of a Kshatriya, and with it the pride of power and anger. And as he approached Vasishtha in true humility, Vasishtha greeted him a *Bramharshi*. Vishvamitra was overcome. After he had got over the feelings of gratefulness and reverence which had overpowered him, and had apologised for all the injuries inflicted by him upon Vasishtha, he begged Vasishtha to tell him why he had not acknowledged him a Brahman earlier, and thus saved himself the sorrow and Vishvamitra from the sin of killing his sons. "Vishvamitra," said Vasishtha, "every time you came to me ere this, you came with the pride and power of a Kshatriya, and I greeted you as such. You came to-day imbued with the spirit of a Brahman; I have welcomed you as such. I spoke the truth then, and I have spoken the truth to-day." Even so, Gentlemen, I venture humbly to claim, have my educated countrymen spoken in the matter of the reforms. The first proposals published in Sir Harold Stuart's letter were open to serious and valid objections, and they were condemned by them. The proposals published by Lord Morley last year were truly liberal and comprehensive in spirit, and they were welcomed with warm gratitude and unstinted praise. The Regulations framed to give effect to them have unfortunately departed, and widely too, from the spirit of those proposals, and are illiberal and retrogressive to a degree. Educated Indians have been compelled to condemn them. They have done so more in sorrow than in anger. Let the Government modify the Regulations to bring them into harmony with the spirit of Lord Morley's proposal, and in the name of this Congress, and, I venture to say, on behalf of my educated countrymen generally, I beg to assure the Government that they will meet with a cordial and grateful reception. (*Cheers.*) I do not ignore the fact that there is an assurance contained in the Government's Resolution accompanying the Regulations that they will

be modified in the light of the experience that will be gained in their working. That assurance has been strengthened by what His Excellency the Viceroy was pleased to say in this connection both at Bombay and Madras. But I most respectfully submit that many of the defects pointed out in them are such that they can be remedied without waiting for the light of new experience. And I respectfully invite both Lord Morley and Lord Minto to consider whether in view of the wide-spread dissatisfaction which the Regulations have created, it will be wise to let this feeling live and grow, or whether it is not desirable in the interests of good administration, and to fulfil one of the most important and avowed objects of the Reforms, namely, the allaying of discontent and the promotion of good will between the Government and the people, to take the earliest opportunity to make an official announcement that the objections urged against the Regulations will be taken early into consideration. (*Hear, hear, and cheers.*)

POVERTY AND HIGH PRICES

I have done, Gentlemen, with the Reform Regulations. There are a few other matters, however to which I wish, with your permission, to invite attention. There is no doubt that at the present moment the Regulations occupy the greatest portion of public attention. But there are other causes of discontent, and some of them far deeper than the objections urged against the Regulations. Amongst them all there is none greater than the deep poverty which pervades the land. I do not wish to enter here into the controversy whether the poverty of the people has increased or diminished since the country came under British rule. What I ask is whether the condition of the people to-day is such as must reasonably have been expected from their being placed under a highly organised civilised administration? Is that condition such as to be a ground for congratulation either to the Government or to the people? It is true that a fraction of the population have become more prosperous than they were before. But vast millions of the people are still dragging a miserable

existence on the verge of starvation and large numbers of them have been falling easy victims to plague and fever. This is a question of vital importance, and deserves far graver consideration than it has yet received. (*Hear, hear.*) The sufferings of the people have been greatly increased by the high prices of food-stuffs which have ruled for the last few years. The hardships to which the middle and poorer classes have been subjected can be better imagined than described. Gentlemen, I do not know whether our rulers have taken note of the evil effects which have been produced upon the minds of the people by these hardships to which they have been thus exposed for several years now, from one end of the country to the other, from year to year, from month to month, from week to week and from day to day. I do not know whether they have obtained any official estimate of the numbers of those that have thus been suffering in silence so long. Nearly two years ago the Government of India was pleased to promise an enquiry into the high prices of food-stuffs. Has the enquiry been made? If not, why not? It is not unreasonable to ask that when the Government finds that a vast proportion of the people entrusted to its care are so poor as they are in India, and that the prices of food-stuffs have suddenly gone up as high as they have, it should lose no time in instituting an expert enquiry into the matter and hasten to adopt the remedies which may be suggested by such an enquiry.

SANITATION AND EDUCATION

Along with the high prices that have prevailed, there have been other troubles which have added to the woes of our people. A wave of malarial fever has passed over large portions of the country, and has inflicted a vast amount of suffering and loss upon the people. Death rates have been running high. These are indications not of prosperity but of deep and wide-spread poverty. The appalling numbers of deaths from plague during the past few years are again a sadly eloquent and yet an unmistakable indication of the weak condition of the people. It is of course the duty of the Government to take every reasonable

step it can to promote the health, the stamina and the national prosperity of the people. And we are grateful for what the Government has done in any of these directions. But we urge that the steps taken have been quite inadequate, and that much more should be done to meet the requirements of the situation. Take for instance, the question of sanitation. Sanitation is in a most unsatisfactory condition among vast portions of the population and in the greater portion of the country. The grants made hitherto for it have been wholly inadequate. Take again the question of education. The provision made for it also is woefully short of the needs of the country. The people as a whole are still steeped in ignorance, and that ignorance forms an obstacle to every improvement. Every time an attempt is made to reach them by instructions to help to save them from any great evil, as, for instance, to tell them to seek the benefit of inoculation against plague, or even to use quinine to protect themselves from malaria, the Government finds itself face to face with the stupendous difficulty that they are so largely illiterate. Now, that illiteracy, that ignorance, lies really at the root of every trouble to which the people are exposed. And yet it is sad to find that progress is not being made in the matter of education as it should be. Nearly two years ago the Government of India virtually promised that primary education would be made free all over the country. But that promise has not yet been fulfilled. The Government of India have for fifty years past by their declarations held out the hope that primary education would be made universal in India. We have been waiting and waiting to see this done. Many measures costing money which should not have been introduced have been carried out. Measures which should have been carried out have been kept back. Among this latter category has unfortunately fallen the question of making elementary education free and universal. Elementary education was made free and compulsory in England so far back as 1870. Japan, an Asiatic power, also made it compulsory nearly forty years ago. It has long been compulsory in America, in Germany, in France, in all the civilised countries of the West. Why should

India alone be denied the great advantages which accrue from a system of free and compulsory primary education? (*Hear, hear.*) That is the one foundation upon which the progress of the people can be built. Is agricultural improvement to be promoted and agricultural education to be imparted for that purpose? Are technical instruction and industrial training to be given? Are habits of prudence and self-respect and a spirit of helpfulness to be fostered among the people? A system of free and general elementary education is needed equally as the basis of it all. I earnestly appeal to the Government of India to take up this question of free and universal primary education as one of the most important questions which affect the well-being of the people, and to deal with it as early as may be practicable.

TECHNICAL AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

Along with this question should be taken up the question of technical education. If vast millions of people in this country are to be rescued from poverty, if new avenues of employment are to be opened and prosperity spread over the land, it is essential that an extensive system of technical and industrial education should be introduced in the country. The examples of other countries point out that to be the road to prosperity. Germany was not at one time noted as a manufacturing country. It has so greatly improved its position as to become a formidable rival to England. America has enriched herself beyond description by multiplying her manufactures and industries. Japan has, in the course of thirty years, altered her position from a mainly agricultural into a largely manufacturing country. The industrial progress and prosperity of every one of these countries has been built upon a wide-spread system of scientific, technical and industrial education. The people of India are not wanting in intelligence or industry. They are willing to undergo any amount of labour that may be required of them. But they lack the education, the skill of the trained man, and are therefore being beaten day by day by the manufacturers of every foreign country which

has built up a system of technical education, and thereby laid the foundation of its industrial prosperity. The manufactures of these countries are flooding our markets and impoverishing our people. It is high time that the Government took up the question in right earnest, and adopted a system of technical education co-extensive with the needs of the country.

PROVINCIAL DECENTRALISATION

Gentlemen, I have no doubt that the Council Regulations will be improved. I have no doubt that the Reforms foreshadowed in Lord Morley's despatch will sooner or later be carried out in their entirety. But even when the Regulations have been improved and those Reforms have been carried out, there will still not be much hope for a real improvement in the condition of the people, unless and until one other essential measure of reform is carried out, that is a Decentralisation of financial power and responsibility from the Government of India to the various Provincial Governments. It appears from some remarks in one of Lord Morley's speeches that this question of a larger decentralisation than has been dealt with by the Royal Commission, has not escaped his Lordship's keen eye, but that he has allowed it to stand over for consideration in the future. In order to effect a real advance in the condition of the people, it is essential that the Government of India should make very much larger grant to the various provinces, should allow Provincial Governments to appropriate a much larger share of provincial revenues to be devoted to provincial needs than at present. But I must say that I have not much hope of this being done unless the vital change that I have referred to above is brought about in the existing system of financial administration. Under that system the Government of India holds itself to be the master of all the revenues of the various provinces, and makes allotments to them, by means of what are called Provincial settlements for provincial expenditure. Under this system nearly three-fourths of the entire revenues of the country is taken up for Imperial purposes and only about one-fourth is left to

provide for all Provincial expenditure. What hope can there be for improvements being effected in the condition of the people, of primary education being made free and universal, of technical education being promoted, of agricultural improvement being brought about, of sanitary surroundings being secured to the people, and of their being saved from malaria, plague and famine, unless a very much larger proportion of the revenues derived from the people is allowed to be spent by Provincial Governments on purposes which directly benefit the people? (*Hear, hear.*) What is needed is that the Government of India should require a reasonable amount of contribution to be made for Imperial purposes out of the revenues of each province, and should leave the rest of the revenues to be spent for Provincial purposes. It should require Provincial Governments to make an addition to their contributions when any special cause may arise therefor, but should look to revenues derived from what are called Imperial heads to meet the rest of its ordinary expenditure.

REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURE

One great advantage of such a system will be that the Government of India will have to somewhat curtail or restrict its expenditure. And it is hardly necessary to say that there is a crying need for such a reduction. In the present condition of the people, it is not possible, it will not be just, to raise taxation to a higher level than where it stands. But there is a source of revenue derivable from economy itself, and justice and the highest considerations of good Government demand that this source should be tapped to a reasonable extent. For years together the Congress has been begging Government to practice economy in the various departments of its administration. In the first place, there is the military expenditure. So a large proportion of the revenues is absorbed by it that there is not sufficient money left for expenditure on many more useful directions. The Congress has been urging for years that the expenditure should be reduced; but it has unfortunately been very much increased. There are several ways of reducing that expenditure. One is to reduce the

number of the men in the army. That probably the Government will not agree to. The second is that as the army is maintained not merely for the benefit of India but for Imperial purposes as well, the British treasury should contribute a fair proportion of the military expenditure of the British Indian Empire. This is a prayer which has often been urged in the past, and it is a prayer which we must urge yet again.

HIGHER CAREERS TO INDIANS

The cost of the civil administration also is extravagantly high, and can well be reduced. The Congress has urged times out of number that the cheaper indigenous agency should be substituted wherever practicable for the costly foreign agency in all the various departments of the administration. It has urged that higher appointments should be thrown open to Indians in a much larger measure than they have been heretofore. We have urged this on the ground of economy as well as of justice. We are thankful to Lord Morley that he has appointed two of our Indian fellow-subjects as members of his Council. We are deeply thankful both to him and to Lord Minto for their having appointed an Indian to the Executive Council of the Governor-General. What we feel, however, is that the claims of Indians to a reasonable share in the higher appointments in the service of their country will continue to have but a poor chance of being satisfied until all examinations relating to India which are at present held in England only, shall be held simultaneously in India and in England, and until all first appointments which are made in India shall be made by competitive examinations only. (*Hear, hear.*) You know, Gentlemen, how keenly, how earnestly and perseveringly, that prince of patriots, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji (*cheers*) has been advocating this important reform for nearly forty years. But unfortunately for us the change has not yet come. In order to qualify themselves for service in their own land, the educated youths of India are still required to go several thousands of miles away from their homes, to pass an examination in England for admission to the Civil Service of India! This

is entirely unjust. It is unjust not only to our educated young men but to our people as a whole. The system is responsible for keeping up the expenditure on the civil administration at a much costlier scale than is justifiable. We must, therefore, earnestly press that simultaneous examinations should be held in India and England for admission into the Indian Civil Service.

Before I leave this subject, I should refer to the appointment of the Right Honourable Mr. Ameer Ali as a member of His Majesty's Privy Council. We all know with what satisfaction the news of that appointment has been received throughout the country. I beg in your name to tender our thanks to Lord Morley for this further remarkable instance of his desire to appoint Indians to higher offices under the Crown. (*Cheers.*)

Gentlemen, it is very much to be hoped that the Government will earn the gratitude of Indians by throwing open higher careers in the Army also to them. It is too late in the day to say that Indians shall not be appointed to the higher offices in the Army in India. Indians who are loyal, who have proved their loyalty by the life-blood which they have shed in the service of His Majesty the King-Emperor, and whose valour and fidelity have been repeatedly recognised, ought no longer to be told that they cannot rise to appointments in the Army higher than Subadar-Majorships and Risaldar-Majorships. Reason and justice favour the departure for which I plead. The Proclamation of 1858 has promised that race, colour or creed shall not be a bar to the appointment of Indians to any posts under the Crown the duties of which they shall be qualified to discharge. We ask Government to give effect to that noble proclamation, to do justice to the claims of the people of India, by opening the higher branches of the Army for qualified Indians to enter. If the Government will accede to this reasonable prayer, it will deepen the loyalty of vast numbers of people in India, and I venture humbly to say, it will never have any cause to regret having taken such a step. On the other hand, the exclusion of Indians from such appointments is a

standing ground of dissatisfaction and complaint. It is in every way desirable that it were removed. By throwing higher careers in the Army open to Indians, the Government will open another important door for satisfying the natural and reasonable aspirations of important sections of His Majesty's subjects. Their attachment to the Government will thereby be enhanced, and if the opportunity ever arose, the Government would find a large Army of Indians trained and prepared to fight under His Majesty's flag to defend the country against foreign invasion and to help the Government in maintaining peace on every possible occasion. (*Cheers.*)

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA

This brings me to the question of the status of Indians in other countries. It is not necessary for me to say how deeply it has grieved us all to hear of the unjust, the cruel, the disgraceful treatment to which our countrymen in the Transvaal have been subjected. (*Hear, hear.*) The indignities which have been heaped upon them, the hardships and harassments to which they have been exposed, have excited deep feelings of indignation and grief throughout the country. These feelings are not confined to educated Indians. They are shared by the literate and the illiterate alike. They have penetrated even into the *zenana*, as is evident from the lists of subscriptions collected by ladies which have appeared in the Press. Touching appeals have come to us from our sisters in the Transvaal for brotherly help and sympathy in their trials. We admire the unflinching courage, the unbending determination with which our noble brother, Mr. Gandhi, and our other countrymen have been fighting for the honour of the Indian name. (*Cheers.*) Our hearts go forth to them in sympathy, and we are sorely grieved to find that the Government of His Majesty have not yet been able to come to their rescue. Our brethren have repeatedly appealed for protection and support to the Sovereign and Parliament of England, whose sway they live under. And it is a matter of deep grief to them and to us, that being the subjects of His Majesty the King-Emperor of India, and being fellow-subjects of Englishmen,

•they should find themselves so long without protection against cruel and unjust treatment, against humiliating insults, in a colony' of the British Empire. (*Shame, shame.*) It is not right to say that the British Government cannot exercise any influence upon the Boer-British Government. It was but yesterday that the Government of England went to war with the Boers, one of the avowed grounds being that Indians had been badly treated by the Boers. Has the position become weaker since the Government has established the might of its power there, that it is afraid to require that the Boer-British Government should follow a course of conduct towards its Indian fellow-subjects different from the one pursued before—a course of conduct consistent with the claims of a common humanity and of fellowship as subjects of a common Sovereign? (*Cheers.*) I have no doubt, Gentlemen, that the Government of India have made many and earnest representations in this matter to the Imperial Government, I have no doubt that they will make further representations still. For the honour of the Empire itself, let us hope that the Imperial Government will yet interfere to bring about an early and honourable settlement of this painful but momentous question. (*Hear, hear.*) But however that may be, the Government of India are bound in honour and in duty to their Indian fellow-subjects to take steps now to actively resent and to retaliate the treatment which is accorded to them in South Africa. (*Hear, hear.*) And the least that they ought to do is to withdraw all facilities for enlisting indentured labour for South Africa, until the white colonists there agree to recognise Indians as their equal fellow-subjects. (*Cheers.*) The matter has been under discussion too long. The intensity of feeling which it has created throughout the country demands that it should no longer be allowed to rest where it is. I will not detain you longer on this question, as time will not permit me to do so. I have no doubt that you will pass a strong resolution expressing your sympathy and admiration for our brethren, Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsis and Christians, who are fighting a heroic fight for the honour of the Motherland in South Africa, and urging upon the

Government both in India and in England the justice and necessity of an early and honourable settlement of this great Imperial problem. (*Cheers.*)

ANARCHICAL CRIMES

Gentlemen, there is yet another painful matter for which I must claim attention, and that is the evil advent of anarchical ideas—of the assassin's creed—into our country. (*Hear, hear.*) It has filled us with grief to find that this new evil has come to add to our sorrows and to increase our misfortunes. Earlier in the year the whole country was shocked to hear that Sir William Curzon Wyllie was shot dead by a misguided young man and that while attempting to save Sir William, Dr. Lalkaka also lost his life at the hand of the assassin. The detestable crime filled all decent Indians with grief and shame;—with grief that a gentleman who had done no one any harm, who had, on the contrary, befriended many young Indians in England, and who was trying to befriend his assassin even at the moment when he was attacked by him, should have been killed without any cause, without any justification; with shame, that an Indian should have been guilty of such an atrocious crime. The pain caused by the news was widespread and deep. There was one circumstance, however, of melancholy satisfaction in the tragedy; and that was that if one Indian had taken the life of Sir William, another Indian had nobly given up his own in the attempt to save him. Gentlemen, in the name and on behalf of the Congress, I beg here to offer to Lady Curzon-Wyllie and to the family of Dr. Lalkaka our deepest sympathy with them in their sad bereavements. (*Cheers.*)

As though we had not had enough cause for sorrow, we have recently had the misfortune to hear of another equally atrocious crime committed at Nasik. The murder of Mr. Jackson has sent another thrill of horror and sorrow throughout the country. Mr. Jackson was being entertained at a party by Indians who honoured and esteemed him because of the good service he had rendered, and because of the sympathy he bore to them. And it was

at such a party that a young man, filled with idea as impotent to produce any good as they are wicked, took away his life! The news has been received with unutterable grief throughout the country, and the deepest sympathy is felt for Mrs. Jackson in her cruel bereavement. I beg to offer to her also our sincerest condolence.

And there was another wicked attempt at a similar crime, though it happily proved unsuccessful. I refer, of course, to the bomb which was thrown the other day at Ahmedabad on the carriage of His Excellency the Viceroy. It is a misfortune that Lord Minto has had to introduce several measures of repression. But I believe that there is a general feeling all over the country that his Lordship has throughout meant well, and that he has laboured as a friend to promote what he has conceived to be the interest of the people. (*Cheers.*) The large-hearted liberal-mindedness which Lord Minto has shown in connection with the scheme of Reform has entitled him to our lasting gratitude and esteem. And it has been a matter for profound regret throughout the country that an attempt should have been made even upon His Excellency's life. That feeling has happily been relieved, however, by an equally profound feeling of satisfaction and thankfulness at his Lordship's providential escape. (*Cheers.*)

I do not know, Gentlemen, in what words to express the abhorrence that I am sure we all feel for these detestable, dastardly and useless crimes. It fills me with grief to think that in this ancient land of ours where *ahimsa*—abstention from causing hurt—has been taught from the earliest times to be one of the greatest virtues which can be cultivated by civilised man; where the great law-giver, Manu, has laid down that no man should kill even an animal that does not cause any hurt to others; where the taking away of life generally is regarded as a great sin, the minds of any of our young men should have been so far perverted as to lead them to commit such inhuman acts of cold-blooded murders without any provocation. Such crimes were confined until a few years ago to some of the countries of Europe. We had no

doubt occasional cases of religious fanatics, called *ghazis* who now and then took away the life of an Englishman on the frontier. But we are grieved to find that these new political *ghazis* have now risen in our midst, and have become a new source of shame and sorrow to the country. I am sure we are all of one mind in our desire to do all that we can to eradicate this new evil from our land. But we do not know what steps should be taken to do so. We have repeatedly denounced these outrages, but those who commit them have obviously gone beyond the reach of our influence. It should be obvious to the meanest understanding that these crimes cannot do any good to our country—they have never done any good to any country,—but, on the contrary, they have done and are doing us a great deal of injury. They are condemned by our *Shastras* and are opposed to the noblest traditions of our race,—“the killing of a man who is not standing up to fight is a sin which leads to the extinction of the sinner”,—says the *Mahabharata*. The whole of the *Mahabharata* illustrates and emphasises the great truth that it is righteousness alone that wins, because its victory is real and lasting, and that unrighteous and wicked deeds, though they may secure a temporary seeming advantage, lead eventually to certain degradation and destruction. It proclaims that even in a war, we should not think of winning a victory by wicked means—“better death by pursuing a righteous course of conduct, than victory by means of a wicked deed”. (*Hear, hear.*) It is inexpressibly sad to think that in a country where such wise and noble teachings have come down to us through long ages, the assassin's creed should have found acceptance in the mind of any person, young or old. Let us endeavour to instil these noble teachings into the minds of our young men. We owe it to them and to our country, to try so far as it lies in our power, to keep them from being misled into the path of evil and dishonour. Let us do it, and let us hope and pray that such crimes, which we all deplore and detest, will soon become matters of past history. (*Cheers.*)

DEPORTATION AND THE PARTITION

Gentlemen, I have referred in an earlier portion of my address to some of the causes of discontent. I should refer to two other matters which have contributed largely to swell it in the last few years. One of them is the deportation of Indians without any trial. (*Hear, hear.*) The Government cannot be more anxious than we are in the interest of our country's progress, to see goodwill and confidence grow evermore between the Government and the people. And we are pained to find that by resorting to a lawless law like the Regulation of 1818, to punish men against whom no offence has been openly urged and established, the Government by its own action excites a great deal of ill-feeling against itself. We all remember how intensely strong was the feeling excited by the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai, and how deep and general was the satisfaction when after six months' confinement, he was restored to liberty. Since then, however, nine other gentlemen from Bengal have been similarly deported. The reasons which have led to their deportation have not been made known. Every effort to induce the Government to publish those reasons has failed. Public sympathy is consequently all on the side of those who have been deported and all against the Government. This cannot be regarded as a gain to good administration. (*Hear, hear.*) If the Government will only have recourse to the ordinary law of the land, to bring to justice any person or persons who might be guilty of encouraging violence or lawlessness or of promoting ill-will or hostility to Government, there will be no room left for complaint. The Indian people are an eminently reasonable people. Let them know that a brother has been guilty of a crime; let the Government only satisfy the public that there is reasonable ground for depriving any man of his liberty, and they will cease to sympathise with the offender. Where sympathy will not entirely die out, its nature will be greatly changed. There will be no feeling left against the Government. But to send away men who have been leading peaceful and honourable lives to distant

lands, and to confine them under the deportation Regulation without giving them any opportunity to hear and answer charges which have been formulated behind their backs, is a course unworthy of the British Government and it ought to be put an end to as early as possible. (*Cheers.*) Even the Egyptian law of deportation is better in this respect than the Indian law. Under that law an opportunity is given to the person whom it is proposed to deport to hear the charges laid against him, though *in camera*, and to answer them. In that way injustice is largely if not entirely avoided. I hope that if the Government is determined to retain the Regulation of 1818 and similar Regulations in the Statute-Book, it will at any rate recognise the necessity in the interest of good administration as much as in the interest of justice, of introducing amendments in the said Regulations to make them similar in the particular respect pointed out, to the law of Egypt. (*Hear, hear.*) I cannot leave this subject without referring to the great service which Mr. Mackarness has been rendering to the people of India in this connection. (*Cheers.*) It is only right that we should make a grateful acknowledgment of that service. (*Cheers.*)

The other matter to which I think it my duty to invite attention is the question of the Partition of Bengal. It is unnecessary for me to say what an amount of discontent and bitterness this question has created in Bengal. That discontent and that bitterness has travelled far beyond the limits of Bengal, and has produced a most deplorable influence in the country. It may appear to be a vain hope, but I do hope that the Government will yet reconsider this question. I do not propose to take up your time by recapitulating the arguments which have been urged against the Partition and the pleas which have been put forward for a modification of the Partition so as to bring together the entire Bengali-speaking community in Bengal under one Government. But I will mention one new and important fact in support of my recommendation. And that is this, that under the Reform scheme the people of Western Bengal are to receive the benefit of

• a Council Government, Eastern Bengal is not to have it, and finds that the destinies of its 31 millions of people are still left to be guided by one single man. (*Hear, hear,*) This gives an additional ground of complaint and dissatisfaction to the people of Eastern Bengal. The Partition as it has been made cannot be defended. It ought therefore to be mended. If the Government will modify the Partition, it will restore peace to Bengal, and win the goodwill and gratitude of millions of men there. It will also enhance thereby its prestige in the eyes of the people throughout the country, as they will feel that the Government can afford to be as just as it is strong. (*Cheers.*)

The mention of these grievances of Bengal reminds me of some of the grievances of the Punjab. My friend, the Chairman of the Reception Committee, has already referred to some of them. They will be laid in due course before you, and I trust you will give them the consideration which they deserve. It is true that some of these questions affect only one province now: but they involve questions of principle, and may affect other provinces in future. One of these, the imposing of restrictions on the alienation of land, already affects two provinces. The Punjab Land Alienation Act has been followed by a similar Act for a portion of the United Provinces, and there is no knowing when similar Acts may not be extended to other areas. These Acts have revived a procedure of protecting the interests of Agriculturists which has become obsolete in civilised countries. The right course for the Government to follow is to illumine the minds and strengthen the wills of zamindars and agriculturists by means of education, so that they may be able to protect their interest and increase their incomes. Instead of pursuing that natural and healthy course, the Government has had recourse to an obsolete and not very rational method of helping them to protect their properties by depriving them of the power of dealing freely with them, and by compelling the agriculturists to sell his land to a brother agriculturist only. This gives the richer agriculturist the

opportunity of buying up his humbler brother, and prevents the latter from obtaining as fair a price as he would get if he were to sell his property in the open market. It also prevents non-agriculturists from acquiring land, and from investing their capital in enriching it. The subject is a very important one, and I trust you will give it your attention.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CONGRESS

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have detained you very long. But I must crave your indulgence for a few minutes more. I wish before I conclude to say a few words about the constitution and the present position of the Congress. Ever since the unfortunate split at Surat, the Congress has come in for a great deal of criticism, both friendly and unfriendly. It is said that there has been a division in the Congress camp. It is true, it is sad. We should have been happy if it was not. We hear a great deal of disapproval, of condemnation, of "a disunited Congress", and a great desire expressed for "a united Congress". I ask, Gentlemen, how are we "a disunited Congress"? Are we not here a united Congress, united in our aims and our methods, and in our determination to adhere to them? (*Hear, hear.*) If we are not a united Congress who is responsible for the disunion? Have we departed in the smallest degree from the lines on which the Congress was started twenty-four years ago. Have we shut out any fellow-countryman of ours who wishes to work with us on those lines from coming to the Congress? I emphatically say, no. It is said that we have adopted a creed. Yes, we have done so because it had become necessary, owing to the influx of some new ideas into the country, to define the objects for which the Congress was organised to prevent a misinterpretation or misrepresentation of those objects. The creed we have adopted is, however, no new creed. It has been the creed of the Congress from the beginning. The foundation of the Congress rests on loyalty to the British Government. (*Hear, hear and cheers.*) That has always been the basic principle of the Congress. The Congress has at no time done or sanctioned anything being done

•
 which would give the smallest countenance to any idea that it wanted to overthrow the British Government. I believe that the vast bulk of the thoughtful people in India, I mean, of course, those who can and do understand such questions, are as much convinced to-day as they were when the Congress was started, that British rule is good for India, and that it is to our advantage that it should continue for a long time to come. (*Cheers.*) That certainly is the feeling of the vast bulk of educated Indians. And, my countrymen, let me personally say this, that if I did not believe that British rule was good for India, I would certainly not say so. If the fear of the law of sedition would deter me then from speaking against it, I would hold my peace, but not soil my lips with a lie, and thereby expose myself to a far more terrible punishment than any that can be inflicted for infringing the law of sedition. (*Cheers.*) I do believe that British rule is meant for the good of India, meant to help us to raise our country once more to a position of prosperity and power. Our duty to our country itself demands that we should loyally accept that rule, and endeavour steadily to improve our position under it, so that while we suffer some certain inevitable disadvantages of that rule, we should realise all the advantages which we can undoubtedly derive by our being placed under it. That being our position, Gentlemen, ever since the Congress was organised, it has made it its duty to bring the grievances of the people to the notice of the Government, with a view to their removal by the Government, and to secure constitutional changes in the administration which could only be brought about by the Government. I may say in passing, that it is the strongest and most unanswerable proof of the loyalty and goodwill of the Congress towards the Government that it has tried during all these years to press those questions on the attention of the Government which affected the weal or woe of the people and therefore constituted a real grievance of the people. The raising of the minimum of assessment of the income-tax, the reduction of the salt-tax, the prayer for the larger admission of Indians into the public services and the

many other reforms urged by the Congress, all illustrate the point. If the Congress were hostile or unfriendly to the Government, it would have left the grievances of the people alone, and let discontent grow among them. It is true that there were at one time some narrow-minded officials who regarded the Congress as disloyal. Their race, I hope, is now extinct. I hope that among the officials of Government there is not a responsible man now who thinks that the Congress means any harm to the Government. I believe that there are a good many among them now who are satisfied that it is the best helpmate that the Government could have to help it to conduct the administration of the country on sound and popular lines. I have referred to this not to defend the Congress against any accusation of unfriendliness to Government, but to emphasise the act that though the Congress did not for a long time adopt a written constitution, it was clear as daylight from the very beginning that it was an organisation whose object it was to bring about reforms in the existing system of administration and a redress of the grievances of the people by appealing to the constituted authority of Government. Later on when some of our brethren earnestly urged that the Congress should have a written constitution, such a constitution was agreed upon, at the Lucknow session in 1899, and it laid down in clear words that the object of the Congress was to agitate for reforms on constitutional lines. That is the object of the Congress to-day. The cardinal principle of the Congress has now been formulated in even more explicit, more unmistakable language. The change has been in the direction of amplifying the objects not of narrowing them. The first article of the Constitution of the Congress, the Congress creed as it has been called, runs as follows :

The objects of the Indian National Congress are the attainment, by the people of India, of a system of Government similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the British Empire, and a participation by them in the rights and responsibilities of the Empire on equal terms with those members. These objects are to be achieved by constitutional means, by bringing about a steady reform of the existing system of administration and by promoting national unity, fostering public spirit, and

• developing and organising the intellectual, moral, economical, and industrial resources of the country.

I should like to know, Gentlemen, if there exists another organisation throughout the length and breadth of this vast Empire which has set nobler objects before itself to achieve. (*Cheers.*) We have made it absolutely clear that we want self-government within the British Empire; a system of Government, that is to say, similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the British Empire; and that we want to participate on equal terms in the rights and responsibilities of that Empire with those other members. (*Cheers.*)

Gentlemen, what higher aim could a sensible, practical patriot and statesman place before himself? Bear in mind the present status of our country, and you at once see how noble, how honourable is the desire to raise it to the position of being a member of a great federation, of a great Empire under one Sovereign, holding some objects in common for the benefit of the Empire and pursuing others independently for its own special benefit. Japan is an entirely independent power. And yet Japan has considered it an advantage to enter into a friendly alliance with England, and England, to do the same with Japan. Some good people tell us that we have gone too far in fixing our aim. Others tell us that we have not gone sufficiently far. But I have not heard one single responsible man put forward any programme of agitation which goes even so far as ours, leaving alone of course one or two irresponsible talkers, whose wild talk is happily not heard now in this country. We have fixed our aim with the utmost deliberation. We consider it high enough to give opportunity for the utmost exercise of patriotic feeling. We feel that with this ideal before us, we can rise to the height of our growth under the British Government by agitating by lawful and constitutional means for obtaining all the privileges which our fellow-subjects in England and other countries enjoy. (*Hear, hear.*)

It is sometimes urged against us that our representatives are not heard or heeded, and that in 300.

of many years of constitutional agitation, we are still labouring under various disabilities and disadvantages. That is unfortunately true; but only partly so. The success achieved by us is by no means ignoble. But even if we had entirely failed that would not establish the inefficacy of constitutional agitation. It would only prove the necessity for more persistent, more strenuous agitation. It is again said that several repressive measures have been introduced during the last two years and that they have made the task of even honest workers difficult. I fully share the regret that these measures have been passed. Let us hope that they will soon cease to be operative, if they may not be repealed. But making allowance for all that, I venture to say that the freedom of speech and action which we yet enjoy under the British Government will enable us to carry on a constitutional agitation to achieve all the great objects which the Congress has set before us. I ask you, my countrymen, not to allow the aspersions which are made against the Congress to go unanswered any longer and to dispel the wrong notions which have been created in the minds of some of our people about its objects. I ask you to tell all our people that those objects are high and honourable enough to demand the steadfast devotion of the most patriotic minds, and to ask them to co-operate with us in realising them. It is a great change that we want to bring about in the system of administration,—a change by which the affairs of the people shall be administered by the voice of the representatives of the people. That change cannot be effected in a day, nor yet in a decade. But I venture to say that if we can educate all our people to stand aloof from and to give no countenance whatever to seditious movements;—I do not mean to suggest that they in any way do encourage such movements at present; if we can prevent sedition from throwing obstacles in our path, and teach our people to devote themselves to build up national unity, to promote public spirit among ourselves and to agitate more earnestly and steadfastly than we have yet done to further constitutional reform, we shall in ten years' time succeed in obtaining a larger measure of reform than was foreshadowed in Lord Morley's despatch. (*Hear,*

hear.) The objects of the Congress are large and comprehensive enough to afford occupation to the most varied inclinations in the minds of our people. If there are some amongst us who do not wish to take part in agitation for political reforms, let them devote themselves to the promoting of national unity, to the fostering of public spirit, and to the developing of the intellectual, the moral and the economic resources of the country. Here is work enough for every Indian who feels the fervour of a patriotic impulse to take up. Let him choose the work which he finds most after his heart and labour to promote it. But let it not be said that the Congress has narrowly circumscribed the scope of its organisation. Let it not be said, for it is not true, that the objects of the Congress are not high and honourable enough to satisfy the cravings for activity of the most patriotic minds. The problems which press for consideration at our hands are both vital and numerous. The condition of our people is deplorable. Vast millions of them do not get sufficient food to eat and sufficient clothing to protect themselves from exposure and cold. They are born and live in insanitary surroundings and die premature preventible deaths. Humanity and patriotism alike demand that, in addition to what the Government is doing, and may do, we should do all that lies in our power to ameliorate their condition. Let every particle of energy be devoted to the loving service of the Motherland. There is no land on earth which stands more in need of such service than our own. It is true that we are labouring under numerous difficulties and disadvantages. Let not those difficulties and disadvantages daunt us. Duty demands that we must solve them; and let us remember that they will not be solved by having small divisions and narrow parties amongst us. In union alone lies the hope of a happy future for our country. Differences there often arise among workers wherever there is a large association of men. But differences should be brushed aside, and all earnest patriots, all true lovers of the country, should unite in a common endeavour to promote common objects by methods and ways about which there is a common agreement throughout the country. (Cheers.)

THE NATIONAL IDEAL

And here, Gentlemen, I wish to say a few words to our brethren of the Moslem League. I deeply grieve to say it, but I think it would be well perhaps that I should say it. I am grieved to think that our brethren have allowed the interests of a sect, nay, of a party, to predominate in their counsels over the interests of the country; that they have allowed sectarian considerations to prevail over patriotic considerations. Gentlemen, no Indian is entitled to the honour of being called a patriot, be he a Hindu, Mahomedan, Christian or Parsi, who would desire for a moment that any fellow-countryman of his, whatever his race or creed may be, should be placed under the domination of the men of his own particular persuasion or community, or that any one section should gain an undue advantage over any other section or all other sections. Patriotism demands that we should desire equally the good of all our countrymen alike. (*Cheers.*) The great teacher Veda Vyasa held forth the true ideal for all religious and patriotic workers to pursue the noble prayer which he taught centuries ago:

May all enjoy happiness; may all be the source of happiness to others; may all see auspicious days; may none suffer any injury.

That is the ideal which the Congress has placed before us all from the moment of its birth. (*Hear, hear.*)

I am a Hindu by faith, and I mean no disrespect to any other religion when I say that I will not change my faith, for all the possessions of this world or of any other. (*Cheers*) But I shall be a false Hindu and I shall deserve less to be called a Brahman if I desired that Hindus or Brahmins should have any unfair advantage as such over Mahomedans, Christians, or any other community in India. (*Cheers.*) Our brethren of the Moslem League have by their sectarian agitation, at a critical period of our history, thrown back the national progress which we have been endeavouring for years to achieve. It is painful and humiliating to think that this has been so. But it is no-

good fretting too much about an irrevocable past. Let us try to forget it. It is a relief to know that there are many amongst them who realise that a mistake has been committed ; many who realise that any temporary advantage which a few members of their community may gain over the members of other communities, is a trifle which does not count in the consideration of large national interests. What does it matter to the vast masses of the people of India that a few Hindus should gain some slight advantage over a few Mahomedans, or that a few Mahomedans should gain some small advantage over a few Hindus ? How ennobling it is even to think of that high ideal of patriotism where Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsis and Christians, stand shoulder to shoulder as brothers and work for the common good of all. And what a fall is there when we give up that position, and begin to think of furthering the sectarian interests of any particular class or creed at the expense of those of others. (*Cheers.*) I invite my brethren to respond to the higher call, and to feel that our lot having been cast in this now our common country, we cannot build up a national life such as would be worth having, in separation, but that we must rise or fall together. (*Cheers.*)

And I have to say a word in this connection to some of my Hindu brethren also. (*Hear, hear.*) I have been grieved to learn that owing to the unfortunate action of the members of the Moslem League—and let me say here once again that I do not make a single one of these remarks without a feeling of pain : I say what I say not to offend any brother, but in order that a better understanding should grow between the two great communities ;—I say, Gentlemen, that owing to the action of our brethren of the Moslem League, owing to the manner in which the agitation for securing what they had persuaded themselves to believe would be a fair representation for their community, and especially owing to several unfortunate and regrettable things that were said during the course of that agitation, a great estrangement has taken place between Hindus and Mahomedans generally all over the

country, but particularly in the Punjab and the United Provinces. Under the influence of this feeling, some of my Hindu brethren have been led to think and to advocate that Hindus should abandon the hope of building up a common national life, and should devote themselves to promote the interests of their own community as Mahomedans have tried to promote those of theirs. They have also said that the Congress agitation has done harm to the Hindu community. With all respect to those who have taken this view, I wish to ask what harm the Congress has done to the Hindus. Have not Hindus benefitted equally with other communities by the raising of the minimum of assessment of the income tax and the reduction of the salt tax, and by the other measures of reform which the Congress has successfully agitated for? But, it is said, some of the officials of Government have shown preference for Mahomedans over Hindus in the public service because the Hindus have offended them by agitating for reforms, while the Mahomedans have not. Well, I am sorry to think that there seems to be some ground for such a complaint as this in the Punjab and the United Provinces. But, Gentlemen, these are mere passing incidents, things of the moment. (*Cheers*) The favours shown are not to live. Let it be remembered that *ex hypothesi* those favours have been shown not out of any love for our Mahomedan brethren, but in order to keep them quiet, to keep them from standing shoulder to shoulder with their Hindu brethren to agitate for reforms. Let the delusion disappear, let Mahomedans begin to take their fair share in agitating for the common good of all their countrymen, and these favours will cease to come. (*Hear, hear, and cheers.*) If there was a real partiality for our Mahomedan brethren, one should have expected to see some real concession made to them, for instance, in some privileges which are denied to us all in the matter of the Arms Act or Volunteering, being extended to them. (*Cheers and laughter.*) But the thought of extending such a privilege to Mahomedans has not, you may safely assume, ever entered the minds of even those among the officials, who have been known to be most inclined to favour

• them. No, Gentlemen, this policy of partiality will not live, as it does not deserve to live. And any temporary disadvantages which may have been caused by it to our Hindu brethren in some parts of the country ought not to lead them to swerve from the path of duty, wisdom and honour which the Congress has chalked out for all patriotic Indians to follow. (*Hear, hear.*) I do not object to representations being made to prevent any unjust preferential treatment being shown to the members of any particular community. It seems to me to be not inconsistent with the true spirit of a Congressman to point out and protest against any partiality shown to any member or members of any community on the ground of his or their belonging to that particular community. If a Mahomedan, Hindu or Christian is appointed to a post in the public service on account of his merit, such an appointment is for the benefit of the public, and no one can have any reason to complain. If a Hindu is preferred to a Mahomedan, not because he has superior qualifications to serve the public, but merely because he is a Hindu, that is a just ground of grievance to the Mahomedans; and not only Mahomedans but all communities will be entitled without departing from the principles of the Congress, to protest against such an appointment on the broad ground of equal justice for all, and because it will excite jealousy and promote ill-will and disunion among people who ought to live in amity and goodwill. If, on the other hand, a preference is shown to a Mahomedan over a Hindu who is not superior but inferior to him in merit and qualifications, a Hindu can protest as much as any other community against such an appointment without departing from the principles of the Congress. But pray let it be done, when it must be done, out of a regard for public interests which demand equality of treatment, equal justice, for all communities. Let it be done with the desire of avoiding causes of disunion. Let it not be done out of a feeling of narrow sectarian jealousy. Let us endeavour to win over our brethren who differ from us to the noble ideals which we have hitherto placed before us. Let not their faults lead us to turn away from those ideals. I have faith in the

future of my country. I have no doubt that the policy of the preferential treatment of one community over another and all other obstacles which keep the great communities of India from acting together, will shortly but steadily disappear, and that under the guidance of a benign Providence feelings of patriotism and brotherliness will continue to increase among Hindus, Mahomedans, Christians and Parsis, until they shall flow like a smooth but mighty river welding the people of all communities into a great and united nation, which shall realise a glorious future for India and secure to it, a place of honour among the nations of the world. (*Loud and continued applause.*)

Twenty-fifth Congress—Allahabad— 1910

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—In selecting me to preside, for the second time, over your National Assembly, you have bestowed upon me a signal mark of your confidence. The honour is great; the responsibilities are also great; and I must ask from you a full measure of indulgences. At the same time, whatever my shortcomings may be, there is one respect in which I shall not be found wanting, and that is in good-will towards you and the cause you represent. My sympathy with your aspirations is whole-hearted; and I cherish an enduring faith in the future destiny of India. India deserves to be happy. And I feel confident that brighter days are not far off. There is a saying that every nation deserves its fate; and my confidence in the future of India is founded on the solid merits of the Indian people—their law-abiding character, their industry, their patient and gentle nature, their capacity for managing their own affairs, as shown in their ancient village organisation. Further I put my trust in the intelligence, the reasonableness, and the public spirit of the educated classes. And last, but not least, I have confidence in the Congress, whose pious duty it is to guide the people in their peaceful progress towards self-government within the Empire.

A few days ago, speaking at a gathering of friends in England, who commissioned me to bring you their hearty greeting, I quoted the words of my dear old friend Sir Wilfred Lawson, who during his long life was ever engaged in some uphill battle for the cause of righteousness. He said that we should hope all things, but expect

•

nothing. This is the spirit which defies discouragement and is beyond the reach of disappointment. During the last 20 years it has been difficult for the friends of India, even to hope. Poor India has suffered pains almost beyond human endurance. We have had war, pestilence and famine, earthquake and cyclone; an afflicted people, driven well-nigh to despair. But now, at last, we see a gleam of light. Hope has revived, and the time has come to close our ranks and press forward with ordered discipline. There is much arduous work to be done, but the reward will be great. In the words of the poet, let us, "march with our face to the light; put in the sickle and reap".

OUR WATCHWORDS

Our watchwords must be "Hope"—"Conciliation"—"United Effort".

"HOPE"

The late King-Emperor, Edward the Peace-maker, whose loss we shall ever deplore, in his message to the Princes and Peoples of India on the occasion of the Jubilee, gave us every ground for hope. In that gracious Declaration, which confirmed and developed the principles laid down in Queen Victoria's Proclamation of 1858, he promised concessions to the wishes of the people, including the steady obliteration of race distinctions in making appointments to high office, the extension of representative institutions, and a kindly sympathy with Indian aspirations generally. Effect was given to those promises by Lord Morley's appointment of Indians to his own Council, and to the Executive Council (the inner Cabinet) of the Viceroy and of the Local Governments, and when he successfully carried through both Houses of Parliament his far-reaching measure of reform for the expansion of the Legislative Councils on a wider representative basis. A hopeful spirit as regards the near future is also justified by the sympathetic tone of the speeches of both the outgoing and the incoming Viceroys. India honours Lord Minto as a man who, under the most trying circumstances, has

bravely and honestly striven to do his duty. According to his view, the unrest and political awakening in India is evidence that "the time has come for a further extension of representative principles in our administration". And Lord Hardinge has promised to "do his utmost to consolidate the beneficent and far-reaching scheme of reform initiated by Lord Morley and Lord Minto for the association of the people of India more closely with the management of their own affairs, and to conciliate the races, classes and creeds".

"CONCILIATION"

And this brings us to the duty of conciliation, as now the first step towards constructive work. As long as Indian leaders could only offer a criticism of official measures from outside, it was necessary that their main energies should be directed towards securing a modification of the system of administration under which they lived. And in such work it was inevitable that hard and unpleasant things should occasionally be said on either side, rendering harmonious co-operation difficult, if not impossible. But now that opportunities have been provided for popular representatives to discuss, in a serious and responsible spirit and face to face with official members, the grievances of the people which they would like to see removed or the reforms which they wish to be carried out, the dominant note of their relations with official classes, as also among themselves, should, I think, be one of conciliation and co-operation. There is an enormous amount of good, solid, useful work for the welfare of the people of India to be done in various directions, needing devoted workers, who will labour strenuously and with a genuine appreciation of one another's difficulties. Such is the work for the economic and industrial regeneration of the country, and for the development of education—elementary education for the masses, technical education, and the higher education of the West—England's greatest boon to India—the magic touch, which has awakened to new life the ancient activities of the Indian intellect. Besides these, there are other important items in the Congress.

programme calling loudly for early attention and settlement. All this means effort, strenuous, well-directed, and self-sacrificing: and it needs co-operation from every quarter. In facing this high enterprise, let us forget old grievances, whether of class or creed or personal feeling. Let us not dwell on matters of controversy, but cultivate a spirit of toleration; giving credit to all that, however different their methods may be, they are true lovers of Mother India and desire her welfare. If, as I trust will be the case, you accept these general principles, I will ask you briefly to consider the specific cases in which, from the nature of things, we must anticipate some difficulty in obtaining the hearty co-operation we so much desire. In so vast and composite an entity as India, there exist necessarily divergent views and divergent action in matters political and social, leading to friction. Among important classes and groups, difficulties have hitherto arisen in three principal directions: we have the differences (1) between European officials and educated Indians; (2) between Hindus and Mahomedans; and (3) between Moderate Reformers and Extremists. Such tendencies to discord cannot be ignored. But my proposition is, that the conflict of interest is only apparent; that if we go below the surface, we find identity of object among all these classes and groups; that all are equally interested in the prosperity and happiness of India; and that the only true wisdom is for all to work together in harmony, each casting into the common treasury his own special gifts, whether of authority, or of knowledge, or of unselfish devotion.

“CONCILIATION;” (1) OFFICIALS AND NON-OFFICIALS

Let us then consider briefly the facts regarding each of the three cases above noted, beginning with that of European officials and independent Indian opinion. In order to trace the growth of the existing tension, we cannot do better than refer to the records of the Congress, which during the last 25 years has mirrored popular feeling, and registered the pronouncements of many trusted leaders; some of whom, also, have passed away, as Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Mr. Justice Tyabji, Mr. Romesh

Chunder Dutt, and Mr. Ananda Charlu; others, as the Grand Old Man of India, are still with us, to cheer us with their presence and guide us on our way. Now what was the feeling 25 years ago of the Congress leaders towards British policy and British administrators? There could not be a more sincere and uncompromising exponent of independent Indian opinion than Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, but nothing could be stronger than his repudiation of any feeling unfriendly to British policy or British methods. As President of the Second Congress in 1886, he said: "It is under the civilizing rule of the Queen and people of England that we meet here together, hindered by none, and are freely allowed to speak our mind without the least fear and without the least hesitation. Such a thing is possible under British rule and British rule only." He then goes on to recount some of the "great and numberless blessings which British Rule has conferred on us", and concludes as follows:—"When we have to acknowledge so many blessings as flowing from British rule,—and I could descant on them for hours, because it would be simply recounting to you the history of the British Empire in India,—is it possible that an assembly like this, every one of whose members is fully impressed with the knowledge of these blessings, could meet for any purpose inimical to that rule to which we owe so much?" Such were, not so long ago, the cordial feelings of educated Indians towards British policy and British administrators. A change of policy produced a change of sentiment. The various measures which caused this sad estrangement are well known; and I will not now recapitulate them, because I am above all things anxious that by-gones should be by-gones. Happily, also, the introduction of the reforms of Lord Morley and Lord Minto has done a good deal to mitigate existing bitterness. Conciliation on the part of the Government has already produced some effect, but it has not been carried far enough to bear full fruit. With a view, therefore, to restore old friendly relations, I will venture to make a twofold appeal to the official class; first, to accept and work the new policy represented by the reforms in an ungrudging, even, generous spirit, and to

carry it further, especially, in the field of local self-government—in the district, the taluka and the village; and, secondly, to facilitate a return of the country to a normal condition by an early repeal of repressive measures or, in any case, by dispensing, as far as possible, with the exercise of the extraordinary powers which they have conferred on the executive, and by making it easy for those who have seen the error of their ways to go back quietly to the path of law and order. Any fresh offences must, of course, be dealt with, but moderate men would have a chance of working effectively for peace, if the public mind was not kept in a state of tension by indiscriminate house-searchings, prosecutions and other processes in pursuit of offences of an older date. There is a saying that it takes two to make a quarrel. May I, therefore, at the same time make an appeal to Indian publicists, in the interest of their own people, to facilitate forbearance on the part of the authorities by realising the difficulties of the administration and by avoiding the use of language, which rouses official suspicion and gives rise to vague apprehension? In this way both parties would make their contribution to peace and goodwill.

As an old Civilian, and as belonging to a family long connected with India, I appreciate the merits of the Indian Civil Service, and believe that there never existed a body of officials more hard-working and trustworthy. But the time has come for a modification of the system. The guardian, if somewhat austere, has been honest and well-meaning; but the ward has now reached an age at which he is entitled to a substantial share in the management of his own affairs. Is it not the part of wisdom to accord this to him with a good grace? During the last few years, official duties, connected with repression, have been carried out with characteristic thoroughness; severe punishments have been awarded and such advantages as could possibly accrue to law and order from this policy have been realised. But the performances of such duties must have been irksome and uncongenial to the British temperament. All, therefore, will be glad of a truce in

those proceedings. It is now the turn of conciliation, which will give encouragement to the great body of well-affected citizens, whose hopes are blighted by disorder and whose dearest wish is to bring back peace to a troubled land. This policy is both the wisest and the most congenial. I am sure, and I speak from personal experience, the Civilian will find life pleasanter, and his burdens lighter, if he will frankly accept the co-operation which educated Indians are not only willing but anxious to afford. This was the view taken by Sir Bartle Frere who said :— “ Wherever I go, I find the best exponents of the policy of the English Government and the most able co-adjutors in adjusting that policy to the peculiarities of the natives of India among the ranks of the educated Indians.” But apart from the satisfaction, and personal comfort of working in harmony with his surroundings, the young Civilian naturally craves for a high ideal in the career he has chosen ; and he cannot but feel a glow of sympathy for the views of the older generation of administrators—Elphinstone and Malcolm, Munro and Macaulay—who foresaw with gladness the day of India's emancipation. Every profession needs its ideal. Without that, it is but a sordid struggle for livelihood ; and every man of a generous spirit, who puts his hand to the Indian plough, must regard the present discord as but a temporary phase, and look forward to the time when all will work together to rescue the masses from ignorance, famine and disease, and to restore India to her ancient greatness.

“ CONCILIATION ” : (2) HINDUS AND MAHOMEDANS

We come next to the case of the Hindus and Mahomedans. This is a domestic question and it is doubtful how far an outsider can usefully intervene. But I will venture to say a few words on the subject, because I feel so strongly the danger to peace and progress, if these two great communities come to be arrayed in two hostile camps. Also in the position I now occupy as your President, I feel to a certain extent justified in my intervention, because one of the principal objects of the Congress, as declared by Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee at the opening

of the first Congress in 1855, was "the eradication, by direct friendly personal intercourse, of all possible race, creed or provincial prejudices among all lovers of our country". Fortified by these considerations, I approached the subject before leaving England, in consultation with esteemed Indian friends who were anxious to promote conciliation; and I am glad to say that hopeful beginning has been made. His Highness the Aga Khan, in agreement with Sir Pherozeshah Mehta and Mr. Ameer Ali, has proposed a Conference, where the leaders of both parties may meet, with a view to a friendly settlement of differences; and at their request, I addressed a letter to some of the leading representatives of the various communities in different parts of India, explaining the proposals and inviting their co-operation. In this connection we may refer to the words of our lamented friend, Mr. Justice Tyabji, who presided over the third Congress at Madras. He recognised that each of the great Indian communities has its own peculiar social, educational and economic problems to solve. "But," he said, "so far as general political questions affecting the whole of India—such as those which alone are discussed by this Congress—are concerned, I, for one, am utterly at a loss to understand why Mahomedans should not work shoulder to shoulder with their fellow-countrymen of other races and creeds for the common benefit of all." This pronouncement seems to place the whole question in its true light. This also is the view taken by Mr. Wilfred Blunt than whom there is no truer friend of Islam. He urges the Mahomedan community to join the Congress movement, "if they would share the full advantages of the coming self-government of their country". Mr. R. M. Sayani, a Mahomedan gentleman of wide experience, who was your President in 1896, carefully analysed the facts of the case, tracing the historical origin of the friction between Hindus and Mahomedans, and at the same time indicating the influences which make for conciliation. No doubt certain recent events have brought into prominence the differences between the two communities; but these differences should not be exaggerated, and we should rather direct our attention to the solid interests

in which all Indians are equally concerned. I would, therefore, commend to the special attention of both Hindus and Mahomedans the facts and arguments contained in Mr. Sayani's presidential address, which will be found in the handy volume, entitled "The Indian National Congress", which we owe to the public spirit of our friend, Mr. G. A. Natesan of Madras.

A recognition by the two great communities of the essential identity of their real interests, however long it may be delayed, is, I feel convinced, bound to come at last. Meanwhile, as practical men, it behoves us to hasten the consummation by utilising every opportunity that presents itself to promote joint action as also by avoiding, as far as possible, those occasions or controversies which led to friction. A good illustration of what may be achieved by the Hindus and Mahomedans standing shoulder to shoulder in the service of India is supplied by the latest news from South Africa. Here, if anywhere, the Indian cause appeared to have arrayed against its overwhelming odds. But thanks to the determined stand made by the Indian community under the splendid generalship of Mr. Gandhi, the long night seems to be drawing to a close and we already see the faint glimmerings of a new dawn. There is no doubt that the manner in which the people of India, without distinction of race or creed, have come forward to support their suffering brethren in the Transvaal, has made an impression on both the Imperial and the South African Governments. In the new Councils, too, members of the two communities have excellent opportunities of working together for the common good, and much may be achieved by them in matters like the education of the masses, higher and technical education, and the economic and industrial development of the country. Such co-operation, besides producing substantial results directly, will also have the indirect effect of strengthening those tendencies which make for joint action in public affairs generally.

"CONCILIATION": (3) MODERATES AND EXTREMISTS

Lastly, we have to consider the differences which have arisen among Indian reformers themselves, between those who are known as "Moderates" and those who are called "Extremists". In 1885, when Mr. Allan Hume, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee founded the Indian National Congress on strictly constitutional lines, there were no differences; for more than 20 years from that date all Indian reformers worked together harmoniously, and, year by year, patiently and respectfully placed before the Government of India a reasoned statement of popular needs. But in 1907, at Surat, there was a split in the Congress. The more impatient spirits, despairing of success by Congress methods, broke away from their former leaders, and sought salvation in other directions, and by other methods. Now, as a mere matter of tactics and expediency, to put it no higher, I would ask, have those other methods been successful? It appears to me that they have resulted in wholesale prosecutions and much personal suffering, without tangible benefit to the popular cause. On the contrary, all departures from constitutional methods have weakened the hands of sympathisers in England, while furnishing to opponents a case for legislation against the Press and public meeting, and an excuse for drawing from its rusty sheath the obsolete weapon of deportation without trial. I should like to put another question, and it is this: If now the tide of reaction has been stayed, and if, in any respect, we have had the beginning of better things, is not this mainly due to the labours of the Congress? I do not wish unduly to magnify Congress results. But what other effective organisation exists, either in India or in England, working for Indian political reform? For a quarter of a century the Congress has been at work, openly and fearlessly, without haste and without rest, educating public opinion, and, at the close of each year, pressing upon the Government a well-considered programme of reforms. It would be a reflection on the intelligence of the Government to suppose that such a practical expression of popular wishes was

without its effect. And, as a matter of fact, Lord Morley's beneficent measures have followed Congress lines, the reform and expansion of Legislative Councils having been the leading Congress proposal from the very first session in 1885. I would, therefore, submit to our "impatient idealists" that there is no cause for despair as regards Congress methods, and I would ask them not to play into the hands of our opponents by discrediting the results of Congress work. Advanced reformers should not preach the doctrine of discouragement, but rather carry the flag boldly forward, as the scouts and Uhlans of the army of progress. We have heard something about "mendicancy" in connection with petitions to Parliament and the higher authorities. But Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, as President at Calcutta in 1906, pointed out that "these petitions are not any begging for any favours any more than the conventional 'your obedient servant' in letters makes a man an obedient servant. It is the conventional way of approaching higher authorities. The petitions are claims for rights or for justice or for reforms,—to influence and put pressure on Parliament by showing how the public regard any particular matter". Assuredly the authors of the Petition of Right were not mendicants. On the contrary, they were the strong men of the 17th century, who secured to the people of England the liberties they now enjoy. In following this historical method, therefore, there is nothing to hurt the self-respect of the Indian people.

I sincerely hope that those who have broken from the Congress, because they have ceased to believe in Congress methods and in constitutional agitation, will consider dispassionately what I have said above and revert to their older faith. But in addition to such men, there is, I understand, a considerable number of old Congressmen, whose attachment to Congress principles is intact, but who are not now to be found in the ranks of the Congress, because they are not satisfied about the necessity of the steps taken by the leaders of the constitutional party, after the unhappy split at Surat, to preserve the Congress from

extinction. These friends of ours obviously stand on a different footing from those who profess Extremist views, and I would venture to appeal to their patriotism and ask them not to be over-critical in their judgment on a situation, admitted by everybody to be extraordinary, which could only be met by extraordinary measures. I would at the same time appeal to you, Gentlemen of the Congress, to consider if you cannot, without compromising the principles for which you stand, make it in some way easier for those old colleagues of yours to return to the fold. Remember that the interests at stake are of the highest importance, and no attempt that can reasonably be made to close your divisions ought to be spared.

“UNITED EFFORT”

We now come to a very practical part of our business. Supposing we obtain agreement on the principles above indicated and secure co-operation among the forces of progress, in what directions can our efforts be most usefully exerted? Hitherto Congress work has come mostly under three headings: I. Constructive work in India, educating and organising public opinion; II. Representations to the Government of India regarding proposed reforms; and III. Propaganda in England. The expansion of Legislative Councils and the admission of Indians into the Executive Councils of the Viceroy and Local Governments has vastly extended the scope of the work under the 1st heading. Independent Indians will now be in a position to take the initiative in many important matters, and press forward reforms, which hitherto have only been the subject of representations to the Government. In order to promote co-ordination and united action in this most important work, might I suggest that, in consultation with independent members of the Legislative Councils, the Congress might draw up a programme of the reform measures most desired, for which, in their opinion, the country is ripe, and on which they think the members should concentrate till success has been attained? As regards the 2nd heading, no doubt the Congress Resolutions will, as usual, be forwarded to the Government of India and the Secretary.

of State. But it would, I think, be desirable to bring your views specially to the notice of His Excellency the Viceroy. This might be done by a Deputation presenting a short address, showing the measures to which the Congress attaches the most immediate importance. Among these might be included such matters as the separation of the Executive and Judicial, the reduction of military expenditure, larger grants for education, and the economic village inquiry asked for by the Indian Famine Union. It would be very useful to know the general views on such topics held by the head of the Government, and the sympathetic replies, given by Lord Hardinge to addresses from other public bodies, makes it certain that we should receive a courteous hearing. In our representation we might include a petition for an amnesty or a remission of sentences to political offenders, as also a prayer for a relaxation of the repressive legislation of the last few years. Personally I should also like to ask for a modification of the Bengal Partition. But at the present moment, on the first arrival of a new Viceroy, such a move would, in my opinion, not be judicious. I have always held that this most unhappy mistake must ultimately be rectified; a modification will be made more practicable for the Government, if, in friendly conference, all those concerned can come to an agreement on the subject, and satisfy the Government that the best administrative arrangement would be a Governor-in-Council for the whole of the old Bengal Lieut.-Governorship, with Chief Commissioners under him for the component provinces.

PROPAGANDA IN ENGLAND

There remains the 3rd heading, Propaganda in England. Will you bear with me when I say that you never seem sufficiently to realise the necessity of the work, the supreme importance of making the British people understand the needs of India, and securing for your cause the support of this all powerful ally. I pressed this upon you in 1889, when I came with Mr. Bradlaugh, and again in 1904 with Sir Henry Cotton. Once more, in 1910, I entreat you to give your attention to this vital matter.

Let me remind you of the twofold character of the Congress work. There is first the work in India: the political education of the people, having for its object to create solidarity of Indian public opinion, founded on the widest experience and the wisest counsels available. This part of the work has been in great measure accomplished. During the last 25 years the Congress programme, stated in the form of definite resolutions, has been gradually matured, and is now practically accepted as expressing independent public opinion throughout India. The Congress Resolutions contain the case for India, the brief for the appellant is complete; and what is now wanted is a vigorous propaganda in England, in order to bring the appeal effectively before the High Court of the British Nation. The work to be done is of a missionary kind, and must be mainly directed to influencing the British people, in whom the ultimate power is vested; and any one who on behalf of India, has been in the habit of addressing large audiences in England, and especially audiences of working men and women, can bear testimony to the ready sympathy shown by the hearers, and their manifest desire that justice should be done. It must be borne in mind that in England public opinion guides the Parliamentary electors; the votes of the electors decide what manner of men shall compose the majority in the House of Commons; the majority in the House of Commons places in power the Government of which it approves; and the Government appoints the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy, who, between them, exercise the supreme power at Whitehall and Calcutta. If Indians are wise, they will keep these facts in view and follow the line of least resistance. Instead of knocking their heads against a stone wall, they should take the key which lies within their grasp. Those of the older generation will remember what striking success attended the labours of Messrs. Mano Mohan Ghose, Chandavarker and Mudaliar, when they came to England in 1885. And only those who understand the true inwardness of things can realise what India owes to men like Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose, Mr. A. M. Bose, Mr. Surendranath Banerjee,

Mr. Wacha, Mr. Mudholkar and Mr. Gokhale, for the work they have done in England, by addressing public meetings, and by personal interviews with influential statesmen. But the visits of these gentlemen have been at long intervals. What is wanted is a systematic, continuous, and sustained effort, to bring before the English public the Indian view of Indian affairs.

In India, there is a new-born spirit of self-reliance. That is good; but do not let it degenerate into dislike for the people of other lands. Race-prejudice is the palladium of your opponents. Do not let any such feelings hinder you from cultivating brotherhood with friends of freedom all over the world, and especially in England. It is only by the goodwill of the British people that India can attain what is the best attainable future—the “United States of India” under the ægis of the British Empire, a step towards the poet’s ideal of a Federation of the world.

In his eager desire for Self-Government, let not the “impatient idealist” forget the solid advantages of being a member of the British Empire; the *Pax Britannica* within India’s borders; the protection from foreign aggression by sea and land; the partnership with the freest and most progressive nation of the world. No one supposes that under present conditions India could stand alone. She possesses all the materials for Self-Government; an ancient civilisation; reverence for authority; an industrious and law-abiding population; abundant intelligence among the ruling classes. But she lacks training and organisation. A period of apprenticeship is necessary, but that period need not be very long, if the leaders of the people set themselves to work together in harmony. Hand in hand with the British people, India can most safely take her first steps on the new path of progress.

IF YOU HAVE NOT ALREADY SEEN
THE INDIAN REVIEW

SEND YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS
WITH A FOUR-ANNA POSTAGE STAMP TO

G. A. NATESAN & CO., MADRAS.

YOU WILL GET FREE

A SPECIMEN COPY OF

THE INDIAN REVIEW

Edited by Mr. G. A. NATESAN.

THE BEST, THE CHEAPEST AND

"The Most Up-to-date Indian Periodical."

SINGLE COPY ANNAS EIGHT.

Annual Subscription, Rs. 5 (Five) Only.

Foreign Twelve Shillings.

Subscription can commence from any month.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., G. T., MADRAS.

APPENDIX—A

TO

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS OF

Dadabhai Naoroji, Calcutta, 1906

Here I confine myself to some of the declarations as to the duty of Liberalism and the absolute necessity of self-government for progress and prosperity.

DECLARATIONS OF THE

RT. HON. SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN

"There is one thing in which I will yield to none of them—namely, in my devotion to the Liberal Party and my faithful adherence to Liberal principles. . . . We are members of the party of progress and action and movement, and not the party of mere resistance and delay." (*The Reform Club*, 6-2-1899).

"The Liberal Party was described by its great Leader as a great instrument of progress. It is a great instrument for progress and the question is how are we best to use that great instrument?" (*House of Commons*, 16-2-1899).

"The views and opinions which I have set before you are those of a Liberal. They are the opinions which have been traditions in that Party. We seek the good of the people through the people and by trusting the people. We wish to destroy privilege or monopoly, whether of class or sect or person, when it is hurtful to the people. And whether in internal constitution or in external policy, we hold that it is not power, nor glory, nor wealth that exalteth a nation, but righteousness, justice and freedom. It is for you to say whether you are with us or against us.

"I do not confound territorial extent with strength nor do I see that the glory or success of the Empire is increased by 'beating down our neighbours.'" (*Election Address*, 21-9-1900).

"The British power cannot there and elsewhere rest securely unless it rests upon the willing consent of a sympathetic and contented people." (*Oxford*, 2-3-1901).

"It is only by the consent of the governed that the British Nation can govern." (*Plymouth*, 19-11-1901).

"What are these principles and facts? The virtues, the efficacy, the justice of self-government. That is one Liberal principle. The appreciation and encouragement of national sentiment. That is another Liberal principle. The recognition of the popular will constitutionally expressed through the people's representatives. That is another Liberal principle. That may do for principles." (*Leicester*, 19-2-1902).

"We Liberals are accustomed to freedom of thought and action. Freedom is the breath of our life. . . . It possesses in two of its most sacred dogmas, the only solution of the chief problems which confront our country in Imperial policy and in regard to our domestic needs. . . . It is the universal doctrine of government by assent—government with the consent of the governed Why, there is but one cardinal condition, again, of Liberal principle—that of direct popular control by those concerned. Now, these are two of the beacons by which Liberal policy should be guided." (*National Liberal Club*, 5-3-1902).

"The principles of the Party (Liberal)—not any new-fangled principles, but the old ones which were as good to-day and as much required as they were two or three hundred years ago—were the only principles which could lead to the happiness of the people and to the development of the power and prosperity of the community." (*Skipton*, 10-12-1902).

"If it can be shown that poverty, whether it be material poverty or poverty of physique and of energy, is associated with economic conditions, which, though supported by the laws of the country, are, nevertheless, contrary to economic laws and to public policy, the State can intervene without fear of doing harm." (*Newport*, 30-11-1903).

- “What is the Liberal Policy? . . . We stand for liberty. . . Our policy is the policy of freedom. It is the policy of freedom in all things that affect the life of the people, freedom of conscience. . . . freedom from class ascendancy.” . . .

(*Norwich*, 26-10-1904).

“John Bull had many weak points no doubt, but he had one good point above all others—that he liked that which was straightforward and open and candid, and honest and above-board both in language and in action.” (*National Liberal Club*, 1-6-1905).

Now, I say, if there is any man who is a true John Bull in respect of straightforwardness, etc., Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is one. I prove with extracts from his utterances:

“Our principles. . . and one of those principles, let me tell you, is that the interests of persons, classes and sections must yield to the general interests of the community.”

(*Portsmouth*, 16-11-1905).

“Good government could never be a substitute for government by the people themselves.” (*Stirling* 23-11-1905).

“Ladies and gentlemen, so much for peace, so much for economy—two cardinal Liberal principles. But here is another—self-government and popular control: and we believe in that principle, not only on grounds of justice and on the grounds of effective administration, but on this other ground—that it exercises a wholesome influence on the character of the people who enjoy the privilege.” (*Albert Hall*, 21-12-1905).

“Sir, in all these subjects on which I have been touching, what is the aim to be kept in view, what is the star which we ought to keep our eyes upon, to see that we are moving in the right direction? It is that we should promote the welfare and happiness and interests, not of any particular class or section of the community but of the nation at large. That is the work of true patriotism, these are the foundations upon which a solid empire may be built.” (*Albert Hall*, 15-12-1905).

“The new government had, he verily believed, the public conscience, the public sense of right, the public love of equity. With these they would win.” (*Liverpool*, 9-1-1906).

"The present government would set themselves to apply the old Liberal principles to legislation and administration, the principles of freedom, of equal treatment of all sections of the community in civil and ecclesiastical affairs. They will include the principle of self-government, the idea that people knew best about their own affairs and would give up the old idea that there should be some superior people in the country who were to tell their neighbours what was good for them."

(*Stirling Burgh—Culross*, 12-1-1906).

"The policy and spirit, which would govern the action of the present government, would be based on justice and liberty, not on privilege and monopoly." (*Glasgow*, 15-1-1906).

"And the third is the belief that, in Ireland, as in every other country throughout the King's dominions, self-government is the best and safest and healthiest basis on which a community can rest." (*Inverness*, 18-1-1906).

"We, lovers of our country, lovers of our constitution, lovers of our public traditions and lovers of plain dealing. . . . I am proud and glad and relieved to see a revival of the old political spirit. . . . the spirit which made Liberalism a moral force, a force making for justice sustained by a belief in mankind, and anxious to better the condition of our common life. . . . It was a great uprising against a doctrine, a habit of thought and practice in public life, a method of government abhorrent to the conscience and heart of the nation"

(*National Liberal Club*, 14-2-1906).

DECLARATIONS OF THE RT. HON. JOHN MORLEY

"Imperialism by all means, if it means mercy, if it means humanity, if it means justice, but if it means your own demoralization, if it means lowering your own standard of civilization and humanity, then, in the name of all you hold precious, beware of it and resist it." (*Sydney*, 25-5-1899).

"When he (Mr. Gladstone) died, Lord Salisbury said of him that he was a great Christian. Yes, and I would add, that he was not a Christian for nothing. I think he must often have used to himself the language of Wordsworth: "Earth is sick and heaven is weary of the swollen words that States and Kingdoms utter when they talk of truth and justice." He, at all events, in

APPENDIX

Face of all the demands of practical politics, did his best to bring those considerations of truth and justice into the minds and hearts of his countrymen. . . . But, I do say that Mr. Gladstone, when he saw the nations going on a wrong path, saw high in the heavens the flash of the uplifted sword and the gleam of the arm of the Avenging Angel." (*Manchester, —Unveiling of Statue, 10-10-1901*).

• "It is this policy of passing measures for Ireland, without reference to the Irish themselves, that is responsible for most of the mischief and misgovernment, from which Ireland has so long suffered. . . . From observation of Irish Government, from experience of Irish Government, from responsibility of Irish Government, I say to you, Gentlemen, face to face, it is a bad Government, it is a Government which no nation, no set of people can be expected to endure in peace, and it is a Government which we in our conscience ought to do our very best, when the time comes, when opportunity presents itself, to put right, as we have put so many other evils in our own system of Government, right." (*Manchester, 12-3-1902*).

With how much more force do these words apply to India! Then again:

"We are going to have, I suppose—well, we may have a proposal to suspend the constitution of Cape Colony. Just picture the scene in the House of Commons. The motion is made to protest against the suspension of Parliamentary Institutions in the Cape Colony. We then all get up, and we all make eloquent, passionate, argumentative speeches in favour of the right of the Colonies to govern themselves. The next day, Mr. Redmond makes a motion in favour of giving Self-Government in one shape or another, to Ireland. We then all pick out a new set of arguments. What was on Monday unanswerable, on Tuesday, becomes not worth mentioning. What was on Monday a sacred principle of Self-Government, becomes, on Tuesday, mere moonshine and claptrap. That is a comedy in which, I, at least, do not propose to take part. The Boers are to have Self-Government in order to make them loyal. The Irish are not to have it, because they are disloyal." (*Edinburgh, 7-6-1902*).

What a true picture of the way in which India is treated!

•

"We are citizens, common citizens of a grand country; we are the heirs of a noble tradition; we believe that human progress can only be won by human effort—and that effort, I hope, all of us in our different degrees, ages and situations, will pursue with determination, with unselfishness and with a resolute directness and simplicity that must in the end win a crowning victory."

(*National Liberal Federation, Annual Meeting, 13-5-1904*).

He was for liberty wherever they could get it.

"He looked forward to a vigorous, progressive, pacific, rational policy. The new Government, he hoped, would realise that courage in large politics was the true common sense and he looked forward to the true progressive movement.

"Last Session, the whole Liberal Party in the House of Commons voted in favour of Mr. Redmond's Amendment, which stated that the present system of Government in Ireland was in opposition to the will of the Irish People, and gave them no voice in the management of their affairs, was extravagantly costly and did not enjoy the confidence of any section of the population, was productive of universal discontent and unrest, and had been proved to be incapable of satisfactorily promoting the material and intellectual progress of the people.

"Surely then, it was incredible that a Party, which supported an indictment so damning, should have no policy for dealing with such a state of affairs. . . .

"He would recall the fact that, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Leader of the Liberal Party, who had stuck to his guns and had saved his party, said, speaking on that very amendment:

"What was the principle at the root of the policy? It was the right of the Irish people to the management of their own domestic affairs. The successive plans, by which this was to be given to them, failed to satisfy the country; but the principle of Self-Government, the principle of an elective element that shall be the governing element in Irish affairs still remains."

(*Forfar, 20-10-1905*).

" But whatever the schemes and wisdom of a statesman might be, he should know that all the glittering adventures of imperial pride were vain and empty, were delusive and gully, if he did not constantly have before him the aim of mitigating the lot of the great masses of men, women and children who were always very near hunger and nakedness."

(*Walthamstow*, 20-11-1905).

DECLARATIONS OF THE RT. HON. H. H. ASQUITH

" The Liberal Party is—as it always has been—the standing enemy of unjustified privileges and of unequal laws. . . . The spirit of Liberalism is a strong and a vital factor—is as strong and as vital, as it ever was—in moulding the conceptions and the ideals of the British people." (*Kilmarnock*, 5-10-1879).

" No one in this country—no British Liberal at any rate—can contemplate with satisfaction, a system, under which numbers of our own countrymen are denied some of those civil and political rights, which we are accustomed to regard, as the necessary equipment of a civilized social community."

(*Leven*, 2-9-1899.)

" We call ourselves Liberals. We are proud of the name. We are prepared to maintain our title to it against all comers. . . . But how do we stand? What has been in days gone by, the essence of the Liberal creed and the spirit of Liberal work? I think, I may say, and you will agree with me, that for the first sixty or seventy years of the present century, the chief mission of Liberalism was the mission of emancipation. It waged war with religious disabilities that offended the conscience and blocked the road to talent . . . more important than either it was the Liberalism of that time which laid the foundations of Democratic Government in a Society which had never been swept and levelled by the tornado of revolution. . . . If we look beyond these shores to the Greater Britain of which we have become Trustees, I think, we see there again, equally clear ground for the application of old principles to new problems. We are proud of the British Empire. There is no distinction on that point between one party in the State and the other. But Empire is a blessing or a curse according

to the spirit in which its responsibilities are approached and handled . . .

"According to what I believe to be the liberal conception of Empire, it is something, vastly greater and higher than this. There are,—I believe, I am speaking your sense, as well as my own—in the judgment of us, Liberals, two tests of a standing or falling Empire. We ask in the first place, does it in all its parts make the standard, not merely of material life, but of all that goes to enrich civilization and humanity, higher and more deeply founded, more securely safeguarded? We ask next, does its unity arise, not from compulsory acquisition of subject races, but from the conscious and willing co-operation of living and self-determining members? Does it rest not upon the predominance, artificial and superficial, of race or class, but upon the loyal affection of free communities built upon the basis of equal rights?" (*Edinburgh*, 10-1-1900).

I pause here a little. We, Indians also, had the good fortune in sharing in the glorious work of the Liberal statesmen of the thirties of the last century. We also had our emancipation by the Act of 1833. What a glorious and truly noble and liberal work was that at that time! I have already touched upon that subject. Had that Act been honourably, loyally and sincerely carried out what a glorious Empire would, by this time, the British Empire have become, and how truly and nobly would the two tests laid down, have been fulfilled! The present grand revival of Liberalism, with its irresistible power, is just the opportune moment, to accomplish, by a bold effort, the redemption of the past failure of duty, conscience, humanity and honour.

"Liberty and Justice, the touchstone of policy of the Empire and its external arrangements In these methods lay the only hope for the future honour of our Empire."
(*Oxford*, 24-2-1900).

"Liberty was the best antidote or medicine for discontent and disloyalty."
(*Tayport*, 14-9-1900).

"It is the work of statesmanship in this country, to make the Empire worth living in, as well as worth dying for. In the long run, every society is judged, and every society survives,

- according to the material and moral minimum which it prescribes to its members." (*Hotel Cecil*, 19-7-1901).

"You should aim from the very beginning, at such a progressive development in self-government, as will in time, ripen into the full autonomy of Australia or Canada. That policy ought to commend itself, not only to the Liberal Party, but to the whole country." (*Hanley*, 14-1-1902).

- "The great experience of Canada, where, by the granting of free institutions, races, which, seventy years ago, were flying at one another's throats, were now sitting down side by side, in harmony and contentment. (That will be the case in India)." (*St. Leonards*, 14-3-1902).

"Mr. Asquith proceeded to set forth the Liberal ideal. This, he said, implied self-government and self-development in fiscal, as in all other matters. An excellent example was to be found in the history of Canada, where internal dissensions and external revolt against the Empire had been quelled by self-government. So that the French and British portions of the population had worked out an ideal for themselves resulting in prosperity." (*Morley*, 2-2-1906).

"If they gave the new Liberal Government, a strong, strenuous, independent working majority, they would find many directions, in which arrears had to be made up, reactionary steps retraced, and lost ground recovered. They would do what they could, both to set right the past and to give the country a new and vigorous start for the future."

(*St. Monans*, 13-1-1906).

"In all this, there was a lesson which ought to be taken to heart, namely, that in English politics, it was the straight-forward, the direct, the plain policy which in the long run paid."

(*Hanley*, 18-1-1906).

"This country, by carrying out the great Liberal principle of confidence in the people and allowing them to manage their own affairs, would have our imperial unity on the broadest, soundest and most stable foundation. It was in this spirit that the new Government hoped to attack other problems of legislation and administration which lay before them."

(*East Fife*, 20-1-1906).

I conclude these declarations by two more of one who, though dead, is still living in our hearts and minds, and whom, Mr. Morley himself, has given his immortality in this world.

Mr. Gladstone says:—"It has been providentially allotted to this favoured Isle, that it should show to all the world how freedom and authority, in their due and wise developments, not only may co-exist in the same body, but may, instead of impairing, sustain and strengthen one another. I am deeply convinced that among us, all systems, whether religious or political, which rest on a principle of absolutism, must, of necessity, be not indeed tyrannical, but feeble and ineffective systems and that methodically to enlist the members of a community, with due regard to their several capacities in the performance of public duties, is the way to make that community powerful and healthful, to give a firm seat to its rulers and to engender a warm and intelligent devotion to those beneath their sway." *(Daily News, 5-5-1905).*

The following was one of Mr. Gladstone's last utterances on the occasion of one of the greatest achievements of his life—Home Rule for Ireland. He said:

"It is the predominance of that moral force, for which I heartily pray in the deliberations of this House and the conduct of our whole Public Policy. . . . There can be no more melancholy, and in the last result, no more degrading spectacle upon earth than the spectacle of oppression or of wrong in whatever form inflicted by the deliberate act of a nation upon another nation.

"But, on the other hand, there can be no nobler spectacle than that, which, we think, is now dawning upon us, the spectacle of a nation, deliberately set on the removal of injustice, deliberately determined to break—not through terror and not in haste, but under the sole influence of duty and honour—determined to break with whatever remains still existing of an evil tradition, and determined, in that way at once to pay a debt of justice and to consult, by a bold, wise and good act, its own interest and its own honour."

DECLARATIONS OF THE RIGHT HON. R. B. HALDANE

"It was their duty, to try to govern the Irish people in a sense which was more akin to their ideas and less entirely subordinate to our own. . . . they recognised, it was a duty binding upon them, by every obligation of honour and policy, that they should strive to bring the administration of Ireland in harmony with the minds of her people and should endeavour by every means to convert the people of this country to a juster view of their obligations to that unhappy land and to a fuller recognition of their title to administer those things that were their own." (*North Berwick*, 23-1-1906).

Now these sentiments and principles apply with manifold force to India to whom the British people are bound to give self-government, not only by rights of birth as British citizens, but also by a "duty binding upon them (the British people) by every obligation of honour and policy", by the most solemn pledges given several times before God and the world.

At Darleton on 24-1-1906, he said:

"The breath to the nostrils of the Imperial Organisation was—FREEDOM."

I make no comments on these declarations as being the statesmen's own. Nobody can more realise their full scope, significance and application to India than themselves.

All these declarations apply with manifold force to India under the peculiar circumstances of a foreign draining domination under which she is suffering—a circumstance which, in its very nature, cannot but be evil.

APPENDIX—B

Constitution of the Indian National Congress Organisation

**ADOPTED AT THE MEETING OF THE CONVENTION COMMITTEE
HELD AT ALLAHABAD ON THE 18TH AND 19TH OF
APRIL 1908**

Objects

ARTICLE I

The Objects of the Indian National Congress are the attainment by the people of India of a system of government similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the British Empire and a participation by them in the rights and responsibilities of the Empire on equal terms with those members. These objects are to be achieved by constitutional means by bringing about a steady reform of the existing system of administration and by promoting national unity, fostering public spirit and developing and organising the intellectual, moral, economic and industrial resources of the country.

ARTICLE II

Every Delegate to the Indian National Congress shall express in writing his acceptance of the Objects of the Congress as laid down in Article I of this Constitution and his willingness to abide by this Constitution and by the Rules of the Congress hereto appended.

Sessions of the Congress

ARTICLE III

- (a) The Indian National Congress shall ordinarily meet once every year during Christmas holidays at such

town as may have been decided upon at the previous session of the Congress.

- (b) If no such decision has been arrived at, the All-India Congress Committee shall decide the matter.
- (c) An extraordinary session of the Congress may be summoned by the All-India Congress Committee, either on its own motion or on the requisition of a majority of the Provincial Congress Committees, wherever and whenever it may deem it advisable to hold such session.
- (d) It shall be open to the All-India Congress Committee to change the venue of the Congress to some other town when such change is deemed by it to be necessary or desirable owing to serious or unforeseen difficulties or other contingencies of a like nature.

Component Parts of the Organisation

ARTICLE IV

The Indian National Congress Organisation will consist of:

- (a) The Indian National Congress;
- (b) Provincial Congress Committees;
- (c) District Congress Committees or Associations affiliated to the Provincial Congress Committees;
- (d) Sub-divisional or Taluka Congress Committees affiliated to the District Congress Committees or Associations;
- (e) Political Associations or Public Bodies recognised as Electorates in accordance with clause (3) of Article XX;
- (f) The All-India Congress Committee;
- (g) The British Committee of the Congress; and
- (h) Bodies formed or organised periodically by a Provincial Congress Committee, such as the Provincial or District Conferences or the Reception Committee of the Congress or Conference for the year.

ARTICLE V

No person shall be eligible to be a member of any of the Provincial or District or other Congress Committees or Associations or Bodies mentioned in clauses (b), (c), (d), and (h) of Article IV unless he has attained the age of 21 and expresses in writing his acceptance of the Objects of the Congress as laid down in Article I of this Constitution and his willingness to abide by the Constitution and by the Rules of the Congress hereto appended.

Provincial Congress Committees

ARTICLE VI

- (a) To act for the Province in Congress matters and for organising Provincial or District Conferences in such manner as it may deem proper, there shall be a Provincial Congress Committee with its headquarters at the chief town of the province in each of the following nine Provinces:—

I. Madras; II. Bombay; III. United Bengal; IV. United Provinces; V. Punjab (including N.-W. Frontier Province); VI. Central Provinces; VII. Behar; VIII. Berar and IX. Burma.

- (b) The Provincial Sub-Committees of the Convention shall, in the first instance, form themselves into Provincial Congress Committees.
- (c) The Secretaries of the Convention Committee shall take steps to form separate Provincial Congress Committees for Central Provinces, Behar and Burma.

ARTICLE VII

Every Provincial Congress Committee so formed will add to its number—

- (a) Representatives elected in accordance with its term of affiliation by every affiliated District Congress Committee or Association referred to in clause (c) of Article IV;
- (b) As many representatives of recognised Political Associations or Public Bodies referred to in

clause (e) of Article IV as each Provincial Congress Committee may think fit to determine.

- (c) Such other persons in the Province as may have attended as many sessions of the Congress as Delegates as may be determined by each Provincial Congress Committee for its own Province.
- (d) All such ex-Presidents of the Congress or ex-Chairmen of Reception Committees of the Congress as ordinarily reside within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Congress Committee and may not have been enrolled as members of the said Committee in accordance with clause (b) of Article VI or by virtue of the provisions contained in any of the foregoing clauses of this Article.
- (e) The Joint Secretary or Secretaries of the Congress ordinarily residing within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Congress Committee, such Joint Secretary or Secretaries being added as *ex-officio* member or members of the said Committee.

ARTICLE VIII

Every member of the Provincial Congress Committee shall pay an annual subscription of not less than Rs. 5.

District or other Congress Committees or Associations

ARTICLE IX

The Provincial Congress Committee shall have affiliated to itself a District Congress Committee or Association for each District, wherever possible, or for such other areas in the Province as it deems proper, subject to such conditions or terms of affiliation as it may deem expedient or necessary. It will be the duty of District Congress Committee or Association to act for the District in Congress matters with the co-operation of any Sub-divisional or Taluka Congress Committees which may be organised and affiliated to it, subject in all cases to the general control and approval of the Provincial Congress Committee.

ARTICLE X

Every member of the District Congress Committee or Association shall either be a resident of the District or shall have a substantial interest in the District and shall pay an annual subscription of not less than one Rupee.

ARTICLE XI

No District Congress Committee or Association or Public Body referred to in clauses (c) and (e) of Article IV shall be entitled to return representatives to the Provincial Congress Committee or Delegates to the Congress or to the Provincial Conference unless it contributes to the Provincial Congress Committee such annual subscription as may be determined by the latter.

ARTICLE XII

Each Provincial Congress Committee shall frame its own Rules not inconsistent with the Constitution and Rules of the Congress. No District or other Congress Committee or Association mentioned in Article IX shall frame any Rules inconsistent with those framed by the Provincial Congress Committee to which it is affiliated

The All-India Congress Committee

ARTICLE XIII

The All-India Congress Committee shall, as far as possible, be constituted as hereinbelow laid down :—

15	representatives	of	Madras ;
15	"	"	Bombay ;
20	"	"	United Bengal ;
15	"	"	United Provinces ;
13	"	"	Punjab (including N.-W. Frontier Province) ;
7	"	"	Central Provinces ;
5	"	"	Behar ;
5	"	"	Berar ; and
2	"	"	Burma.

Provided, as far as possible, that one-fifth of the total number of representatives shall be Mahomedans.

All ex-Presidents of the Congress, residing or present in India, and the Central Secretaries of the Congress, who shall also be *ex-officio* General Secretaries of the All-India Congress Committee shall be *ex-officio* members in addition.

ARTICLE XIV

The representatives of each Province shall be elected by its Provincial Congress Committee at a meeting held, as far as possible, before the 30th of November for each year. If any Provincial Congress Committee fail to elect its representatives, the said representatives shall be elected by the Delegates for that Province present at the ensuing Congress. In either case, the representatives of each Province shall be elected from among the members of its Provincial Congress Committee, and the election shall be made, as far as possible, with due regard to the proviso in Article XIII.

ARTICLE XV

The names of the representatives so elected by the different Provinces shall be communicated to the General Secretaries. These together with the names of the *ex-officio* members shall be announced at the Congress.

ARTICLE XVI

The President of the Congress at which the All-India Congress Committee comes into existence shall, if he ordinarily resides in India, be *ex-officio* President of the All-India Congress Committee. In his absence the members of the All-India Congress Committee may elect their own President.

ARTICLE XVII

(a) The All-India Congress Committee so constituted shall hold office from the dissolution of the Congress at which it comes into existence till the dissolution of the following Congress.

(b) If any vacancy arises by death, resignation or otherwise, the remaining members of the Province in respect of which the vacancy has arisen shall be competent to fill it up for the remaining period.

ARTICLE XVIII

(a) It will be the duty of the All-India Congress Committee to take such steps as it may deem expedient and practicable to carry on the work and propaganda of the Congress and it shall have the power to deal with all such matters of great importance or urgency as may require to be disposed of in the name of and for the purposes of the Congress, in addition to matters specified in this Constitution as falling within its powers or functions.

(b) The decision of the All-India Congress Committee shall, in every case above referred to, be final and binding on the Congress and on the Reception Committee, or the Provincial Congress Committee, as the case may be, that may be affected by it.

ARTICLE XIX

On the requisition in writing of not less than 20 of its members, the General Secretaries shall convene a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee at the earliest possible time.

Electorates and Delegates.

ARTICLE XX

The right of electing Delegates to the Indian National Congress shall vest exclusively in (1) the British Committee of the Congress; (2) Provincial or District or other Congress Committees or Associations formed or affiliated as hereinabove laid down; and (3) such Political Associations or Public Bodies of more than three years' standing as may be recognised in that behalf by the Provincial Congress Committee of the Province to which the Political Association or Public Body belongs, provided that no such Political Association or Public Body shall be so recognised unless the said Political Association or Public Body, by a Resolution at General Meeting of its members, expresses its acceptance of the principles embodied in Article I of this Constitution and makes the acceptance of the same a condition precedent to new membership.

ARTICLE XXI

All Delegates to the Indian National Congress shall pay a fee of Rs. 20 each and shall be not less than 21 years of age at the date of election.

[Reception Committee of the Congress

ARTICLE XXII

(a) The Provincial Congress Committee of the Province in which the Congress is to be held shall take steps to form a Reception Committee for the Congress. Everyone, who ordinarily resides in the Province, fulfils the conditions laid down in Article V of this Constitution and pays a minimum contribution of Rs. 25, shall be eligible as a member of the Reception Committee.

(b) No one who is only a member of the Reception Committee, but not a Delegate, shall be allowed to vote or take part in the debate at the Congress.

(c) The Reception Committee shall be bound to provide the necessary funds for meeting all the expenses of the Congress as also the cost of preparing, printing, publishing and distributing the Report of the Congress.

Election of the President

ARTICLE XXIII

(a) In the month of June, the Reception Committee shall consult the several Provincial Congress Committees as to the election of the President for the year's Congress. The Provincial Congress Committees shall make their recommendations by the end of July; and in the month of August the Reception Committee shall meet to consider the recommendations. If the person recommended by a majority of the Provincial Congress Committees is accepted by a majority of the members of the Reception Committee present at a special meeting called for the purpose, that person shall be the President of the next Congress. If, however, the Reception Committee is unable to elect the President in the manner mentioned above, the matter shall forthwith be referred by it to the All-India Congress Committee, whose decision shall be arrived at as far

as possible, before the end of September. In either case, the election shall be final.

Provided that in no case shall the person elected President belong to the Province in which the Congress is to be held.

(b) There shall be no formal election of the President by or in the Congress, but merely the adoption (in accordance with the provisions in that behalf laid down in Rule 3, clause (b) of the "Rules" of a formal resolution requesting the President, already elected in the manner hereinabove laid down, to take the chair.

Subjects Committee

ARTICLE XXIV

The Subjects Committee to be appointed at each session of the Congress to settle its programme of business to be transacted shall as far as possible consist of:

Not more than 15 representatives of Madras ;			
„	15	„	„ Bombay ;
„	20	„	„ United Bengal ;
„	15	„	„ United Provinces ;
„	13	„	„ Punjab (including N - W F. Province) ;
„	7	„	„ Central Provinces ;
„	5	„	„ Behar ;
„	5	„	„ Berar ;
„	2	„	„ Burma ;
„	5	„	„ British Committee of the Congress ;
and additional 10		„	„ the Province in which the Congress is held.

All the above mentioned representatives being elected, in accordance with Rule 9 of the "Rules" by the Delegates attending the Congress from the respective Provinces.

The President of the Congress for the year, the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the year, all Ex-Presidents and Ex-Chairmen of Reception Committees, the General Secretaries of the Congress, the local Secretaries of the Congress for the year, not exceeding six in number, and all members of the

All-India Congress Committee for the year, shall, in addition, be *ex-officio* members of the Subjects Committee.

ARTICLE XXV

The President of the Congress for the year shall be *ex-officio* Chairman of the Subjects Committee.

Contentious Subjects and Interest of Minorities

ARTICLE XXVI

(a) No subject shall be passed for discussion by the Subjects Committee or allowed to be discussed at any Congress by the President thereof, to the introduction of which the Hindu or Mahomedan Delegates, as a body, object by a majority of $\frac{3}{4}$ ths of their number; and if, after the discussion of any subject, which has been admitted for discussion, it shall appear that the Hindu or Mahomedan delegates, as a body, are, by a majority of $\frac{3}{4}$ ths of their number, opposed to the resolution which it is proposed to pass thereon, such resolution shall be dropped.

(b) The President of the Congress for the year may nominate 5 Delegates to the Subjects Committee to represent minorities or to make up such deficiencies as he may think necessary.

(c) In any representations which the Congress may make or in any demands which it may put forward for the larger association of the people of India with the administration of the country, the interests of minorities shall be duly safeguarded.

Voting at the Congress

ARTICLE XXVII

Ordinarily, all questions shall be decided by a majority of votes as laid down in Rule 21 of the "Rules" but in cases falling under Article XXX of this Constitution or whenever a division is duly asked for in accordance with Rule 22 of the "Rules" the voting at the Congress shall be by Provinces only. In cases falling under clause (1) of Article XXX, each Province shall have one vote, to be given as determined by a majority of its Delegates present at the Congress. In all other cases of voting by Provinces, the vote of each Province, determined as aforesaid, shall be equivalent to the number of representatives assigned to the Province in constituting the All-India Congress Committee.

The British Committee of the Congress**ARTICLE XXVIII**

The Reception Committee of the Province in which the Congress is held shall remit to the British Committee of the Congress, through the General Secretaries of the Congress, half the amount of the fees received by it from Delegates.

General Secretaries**ARTICLE XXIX**

(a) The Indian National Congress shall have two General Secretaries who shall be annually elected by the Congress. They shall be responsible for the preparation, publication and distribution of the Report of the Congress. They shall also be responsible for the preparation and circulation of Draft Resolutions of the Congress, which they must send to the Provincial Congress Committees at the latest in the first week of December.

(b) The All-India Congress Committee shall make adequate provision for the expenses of the work devolving on the General Secretaries, either out of the surplus at the disposal of the Reception Committee or by calling upon the Provincial Congress Committees to make such contribution as it may deem fit to apportion among them.

Changes in the Constitution or Rules**ARTICLE XXX**

No addition, alteration or amendment shall be made (i) in Article I of this Constitution except by an unanimous vote of all the Provinces, and (ii) in the rest of this Constitution or in the "Rules" except by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the votes of the Provinces, provided, in either case, that no motion for any such addition, alteration or amendment shall be brought before the Congress unless it has been previously accepted by the Subjects Committee of the Congress for the year.

Transitory Provision**ARTICLE XXXI**

(a) The Committee appointed by the Convention at Surat on 28th December, 1907, for drawing up a Constitution for the Congress shall exercise all the powers of the All-India Congress Committee till the formation of the latter at the next session of the Congress.

(b) The Secretaries of the said Convention Committee shall discharge the duties of the General Secretaries of the Congress till the dissolution of the next session of the Congress.

(c) The President and Secretaries of the Convention Committee should, in consultation with the Secretaries of the several Provincial Sub-Committees, arrange for the holding of a meeting of the Congress during Christmas next in accordance with this Constitution.

(d) For the year 1908, the Reception Committee may, in electing the President, consult the Provincial Congress Committees in the beginning of October, before the end of which month, the Provincial Congress Committees, on being so consulted, shall make their recommendations, and the rest of the procedure prescribed in Article XXIII should be followed and completed, as far as possible, before the end of November.

RASHBEHARY GHOSE,

President, Convention Committee.

DINSHA EDULJI WACHA,

DAJI ABAJI KHARE,

Hon. Secretaries, Convention Committee.

APPENDIX C

Constitution of the Indian National Congress

(As amended at the Bombay Congress, 1934.)

OBJECT

ARTICLE I

The object of the Indian National Congress is the attainment of *Poorna Swaraj* (Complete Independence) by all legitimate and peaceful means.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

ARTICLE II

The Indian National Congress shall comprise—

- (1) Members enrolled in primary committees under Article III;
- (2) Provincial Congress Committees;
- (3) Annual Session;
- (4) All India Congress Committee;
- (5) Working Committee;

and may comprise (a) committees or associations directly organised by the A. I. C. C. or the Working Committee, or (b) committees organised by any Provincial Congress Committee in accordance with the rules framed by it in that behalf and approved by the Working Committee.

MEMBERSHIP

ARTICLE III

(a) Any person over the age of 18 years who believes in Article I shall, on making a written declaration to that effect and presenting an application in form A (omitted)

And on payment of four annas, be entitled to be placed on the register of Congress members kept at any office duly authorised in that behalf within the district in which he ordinarily resides or carries on business.

Provided that no person shall be a member of more than one primary committee at the same time.

(b) The application shall be presented in duplicate and may be handed in personally or sent by post or messenger.

(c) It shall state the full name, age, sex and occupation of the applicant as also the village, the taluka, the district and the Province in which he ordinarily resides or carries on business.

(d) The official receiving the application after recording on it the date of receipt, serial number and such other particulars as may be prescribed shall send one of the duplicates to the office of the Provincial Congress Committee concerned.

(e) The applicant, on being enrolled, shall receive a certificate of membership as per form B (omitted) and printed on durable paper, either in the language and script of the Province in which he resides or in the Hindustani language written in Devanagari or Urdu script.

(f) Unless otherwise directed by the Working Committee the year of the membership shall be reckoned from April 1st to March 31st and there shall be no reduction in the subscription to be paid by members joining in the middle of the year.

PROVINCES

ARTICLE IV

(a) The following shall be the provinces with the headquarters mentioned against them:

<i>Province</i>	<i>Language</i>	<i>Headquarters</i>
1. Ajmer-Merwara	Hindustani	Ajmer
2. Andhra	Telugu	Bezwada
3. Assam	Assamese	Gauhati
4. Behar	Hindustani	Patna
5. Bengal	Bengali	Calcutta

<i>Province</i>	<i>Language</i>	<i>Headquarters</i>
6. Berar	Marathi	Amraoti
7. Bombay (City)	Marathi and Gujarati	Bombay
8. Burma	Burmese	Rangoon
9. Central Provinces (Marathi)	Marathi	Nagpur
10. Delhi	Hindustani	Delhi
11. Gujarat	Gujarati	Ahmedabad
12. Karnatak	Kannada	Dharwar
13. Kerala	Malayalam	Calicut
14. Mahakoshal (Central Provinces Hindustani)	Hindustani	Jubbulpore-
15. Maharashtra	Marathi	Poona
16. N.-W. F. Province	Hindustani	Peshawar
17. Punjab	Punjabi	Lahore
18. Sindh	Sindhi	Karachi
19. Tamil Nadu	Tamil	Madras
20. United Provinces	Hindustani	Lucknow
21. Utkal	Oriya	Cuttack

(b) Any Provincial Congress Committee with the previous sanction of the Working Committee shall have the power to alter its headquarters from time to time.

(c) The Working Committee may after ascertaining the wishes of the Provincial Congress Committee or Committees concerned constitute a new Province, or assign to a Province districts from another Province as also assign an Indian State to any Province.

QUALIFICATIONS

ARTICLE V

(a) No member shall be entitled to exercise his vote at any election unless he has been continuously on a Congress register for six months prior to the date of the election.

(b) No member even if he is qualified under Clause (a) hereof shall be eligible for election to an office or to membership of any Congress Committee unless

(i) he is a habitual wearer wholly of hand-spun and hand-woven khaddar ;

(ii) he has performed some manual labour continuously for six months immediately before the date of nomination for election, on behalf of or for the Congress, equal in value to 500 yards per month of well-spun yarn of over ten counts, and in time to eight hours per month; the forms of acceptable labour alternative to spinning being prescribed from time to time by the Working Committee in consultation with the Provincial Congress Committees concerned and the All India Village Industries' Association or the All India Spinners' Association;

(iii) at the time of offering himself for such election he is not a member at the same time of any other parallel committee.

(c) No person who is a member of any elected Congress Committee shall be member of any similar committee of a communal organisation the object or programme of which involves political activities which are, in the opinion of the Working Committee, anti-national and in conflict with those of the Congress.

ELECTION OF DELEGATES

ARTICLE VI

(a) At the end of every Annual Session the Working Committee shall fix a date and time not earlier than eight months after the date of such decision when every Provincial Congress Committee shall send to the Working Committee a certified list of members of its primary committees qualified to vote. The list must reach the office of the Working Committee on or before the said or any other extended date and time.

(b) Members included in the said list shall alone be entitled to vote at the election of delegates in that province.

(c) In the event of a Provincial Congress Committee failing to furnish the lists in time, the province concerned may be disentitled to elect its delegates.

(d) On receipt of the aforesaid lists the Working Committee shall fix the date by which the election of delegates

must be held and the quota of delegates which each province is entitled to return, and call upon the Provincial Congress Committees to proceed with the election of their respective quota.

(e) For the purposes of election the provinces referred to in Article IV hereof shall be divided into rural and urban areas.

NOTE;—'Urban area' means towns which have a population of more than ten thousand persons. 'Rural area' means area other than urban.

(f) The rural area as also every town with a population of more than 10,000 persons in a district shall each be entitled to elect one delegate for every five hundred duly qualified members on the rolls of its primary committees or for such other number as may be fixed by the Working Committee in accordance with Clause (h) hereof subject to the following:

(i) The maximum number of delegates shall not exceed two thousand. Out of the said number 511 shall be the maximum for the urban area and 1,489 for the rural area.

(ii) No province shall be entitled to return a larger number of delegates than a proportion of one delegate to every 150,000 of the inhabitants of such province including the Indian States or agencies therein, or its fraction thereof, in accordance with the census of 1921.

Proviso I. The maximum number of delegates sent by the urban area in each province shall not exceed 25 per cent of the total number returnable by the province as aforesaid.

Proviso II. Bombay (City) shall have a maximum quota of 21 delegates.

Proviso III. Every province shall be entitled to return a minimum of 10 delegates irrespective of the strength of its primary members.

(g) (i) Where the rural area of a district has a sufficient number of duly qualified members on the rolls of its primary committees, the Provincial Congress Committee shall divide such area into suitable circles, so as to include in each circle not

less than five hundred duly qualified members and each such circle shall be entitled to elect a delegate.

(ii) On a demand made in writing by 500 duly qualified members enrolled on the primary committees of one or more contiguous circles of a district, the said circles, where possible, shall be combined into a plural-member constituency of not more than five seats.

(iii) Wherever possible, a town with a population of more than 10,000 persons shall be divided into plural member constituencies of not less than five and not more than ten seats, provided the constituency can have at least 500 duly qualified members to every seat. But where the number of duly qualified members is less than 2,500 the town shall be formed into a plural-member constituency with one seat to not less than 500 members each.

(iv) Election in plural-member constituencies shall be by proportional representation by single transferable vote.

(h) If and when necessary, the Working Committee may readjust the proportion of 500 duly qualified members to one delegate and prescribe a higher figure for any urban or rural area so that the total number of urban and rural delegates in each province may be in the proportion of 1 to 3 and may not in the aggregate exceed the maximum prescribed for it under f (ii).

(i) The province which has not completed its election on or before the date appointed by the Working Committee may at the discretion of the Working Committee be disentitled to be represented at the Annual Session.

(j) A certified list of delegates shall be submitted by the Provincial Congress Committees not later than the date fixed by the Working Committee in that behalf.

(k) Every delegate so elected shall, on payment of a fee of Rs. 5 at the office of the Provincial Congress Committee of his province, receive a certificate in accordance with Form C (omitted) duly signed by one of its secretaries. No delegate shall be entitled to exercise any of his functions or powers without such certificate.

ELECTION BY THE DELEGATES**ARTICLE VII**

(a) On receipt by the Working Committee of the list of delegates it shall fix a date on which the delegates in every province shall assemble in a meeting to transact the following business :

(i) to propose the candidate or candidates for the Presidentship of the Congress for the ensuing year and to record the vote of each of the delegates assembled on the proposals ;

(ii) to elect from among themselves one-twelfth of their number as representatives of the province on the All India Congress Committee ;

(iii) in case the number of delegates for the province exceeds 100, to elect from among themselves a number of members which, together with the members of the All India Congress Committee elected under Clause (ii), would amount to 100 to constitute the Provincial Congress Committee of the province.

(b) The elections in sub-Clauses (ii) and (iii) of Clause (a) shall be by proportional representation by single transferable vote.

(c) The Secretaries of the respective Provincial Congress Committees shall issue certificates of membership of the All India Congress Committee to the persons elected on it.

PROVINCIAL CONGRESS COMMITTEES**ARTICLE VIII**

(a) The delegates elected from a province under Article VI, or where the number of delegates is more than 100, one hundred delegates elected under Article VII (a) (iii), as the case may be, and the President and the Ex-Presidents of the Congress provided they are duly qualified under Articles III and V, shall form its Provincial Congress Committee.

(b) Every Provincial Congress Committee shall

(i) subject to the general control and supervision of the A. I. C. C., be in charge of the affairs of the Congress within its own province and to that end frame rules not inconsistent with this Constitution, which rules shall come into operation only with the previous sanction of the Working Committee ;

(ii) submit an annual report of the work in the province to the Working Committee not later than one month before the commencement of the Annual Session ;

(iii) before the new A. I. C. C. meets as Subjects Committee under Article IX (g), pay to the Working Committee the fees received from the delegates, as also such subscription as may be fixed by the latter, having regard to the population, membership and financial capacity of the province. Delegates and members of the A. I. C. C. from provinces in default shall not be permitted to take part in any of the proceedings of the Congress or any Committee thereof.

ANNUAL SESSION

ARTICLE IX

(a) The Annual Session shall be ordinarily held during the month of February or March. The said Session shall be held at the place decided upon at the preceding Session or such other place as may be determined by the Working Committee.

(b) The Annual Session shall consist of—

(i) the President of the Congress ;

(ii) the Ex-Presidents of the Congress, provided they are duly qualified under Articles III and V ;

(iii) the delegates elected under Article VI.

(c) The Provincial Congress Committee concerned shall make such arrangements for holding the Annual Session as may be deemed necessary, and for this purpose shall form a Reception Committee, and may include therein persons who are not its members.

(d) The Reception Committee shall collect funds for the expenses of the Session, make all necessary arrangements for the reception and accommodation of delegates and visitors and for the printing of the Report of the proceedings of the Session.

(e) The Reception Committee shall elect its Chairman and other office-bearers from amongst its own members.

(f) (i) As soon as may be, after the receipt of the report by the Working Committee of the names of Presidents proposed by the delegates of various provinces and the number of votes recorded in favour of each, the Working Committee shall announce as President-elect the name of the member obtaining the largest number of votes.

(ii) In the event of an emergency arising by reason of any cause, such as the death or resignation of the President elected in this manner, the Working Committee shall, not later than a fortnight after the emergency, elect as President the person standing next in order.

(g) The new A. I. C. C. shall meet as Subjects Committee at least two days before the Annual Session under the presidentship of the President-elect. The out-going Working Committee shall submit to it the draft programme of the work for the Session including resolutions recommended by the different Provincial Congress Committees.

(h) The Subjects Committee shall proceed to discuss the programme and shall frame resolutions for being moved in the open Session. At least one day shall be allotted for the consideration of propositions of which due notice has been given by Provincial Congress Committees or members of the A. I. C. C. other than those of the Working Committee in accordance with the rules prescribed in that behalf

(i) At each sitting of the Congress, the order in which business shall be transacted shall be as follows :

(i) The resolutions recommended for adoption by the Subjects Committee.

(ii) Any substantive motion not included in (i) and which 25 delegates request the President in writing, before the commencement

of the day's sitting, to be allowed to place before the Congress; provided, however, that no such motion shall be allowed unless it has been previously discussed at a meeting of the Subjects Committee and has received the support of at least a third of the members then present.

(j) The receipts and disbursements of the Reception Committee shall be audited by an auditor or auditors appointed by the Provincial Congress Committee concerned, and the statement of accounts together with the auditor's report shall be submitted by the Provincial Congress Committee to the Working Committee, not later than three months after the termination of the Annual Session.

SPECIAL SESSION

ARTICLE X

(a) The Working Committee may upon its own motion or shall upon a joint requisition addressed to it, as provided in Article XVI (e), convene a meeting of the All India Congress Committee for considering a resolution for holding a special session. Such resolution shall be effective if passed by two-thirds majority of the members present. Thereupon the Working Committee shall summon a Special Session of the Congress at such time and place as it shall determine and the Articles of the Constitution shall apply with such modifications as the Working Committee may consider necessary, provided that the delegates of the preceding session shall be the delegates for such Special Session.

(b) The President of a Special Session shall be elected by the delegates.

ALL-INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE

ARTICLE XI

(a) The President of the Annual Session, members of the A. I. C. C. elected under Article VII (ii) and the Ex-Presidents referred to in Article IX (b) (ii) shall constitute the A. I. C. C.

(b) The A. I. C. C. shall carry out the programme of work laid down by the Congress from session to session and deal with all new matters that may arise during its term of office.

(c) The A. I. C. C. shall have the power to frame rules, not inconsistent with this Constitution, for regulating all matters connected with the Congress.

(d) The President of the Annual Session shall be the Chairman of the A. I. C. C.

(e) The A. I. C. C. shall meet as often as required by the Working Committee, or on a joint requisition addressed to the Working Committee by not less than fifteen members. Such requisition shall specify the purpose for which the requisitionists desire a meeting of the A. I. C. C. At such meeting additional items of business may be brought up for consideration, provided due notice thereof has been given to the members.

(f) Twenty-five or one-third of the total number of members, whichever is less, shall form the quorum.

(g) The A. I. C. C. shall hold office till the meeting of the new A. I. C. C. as Subjects Committee immediately before the next Annual Session.

(h) The A. I. C. C. shall, at its first meeting every year, nominate a panel of twelve members to enquire into and decide all election disputes coming before it. Each party to the dispute shall nominate one out of this panel to represent itself, and the President shall appoint an umpire from the panel.

(i) The A. I. C. C. may from time to time affiliate to the Congress such organisations as it may deem necessary provided such organisations are calculated to further or assist the object of the Congress.

(j) Every member of the All India Congress Committee, ex-officio or elected shall pay an annual subscription of Rs. 10 payable at or before the first meeting of the All India Congress Committee. Members in default will not be permitted to take part in any meeting of the All India Congress Committee, the Subjects Committee or in any Session.

THE WORKING COMMITTEE

ARTICLE XII

(a) The President of the Annual Session shall for his term of office select fourteen members from among the members of the A. I. C. C. to constitute his Working Committee including not more than three General Secretaries and not more than two Treasurers of the Congress.

(b) The Working Committee shall be the executive authority and as such shall have the power to carry into effect the policy and programme laid down by the A. I. C. C. and the Congress, and shall remain responsible thereto.

(c) The Working Committee shall place before every meeting of the A. I. C. C. the reports of its proceedings and the agenda of the meeting, and shall assign at least one clear day for resolutions of which due notice may have been given by the members of the A. I. C. C. other than those of the Working Committee in accordance with the rules prescribed in that behalf.

(d) The Working Committee shall appoint one or more inspectors to examine the records, papers and account books of all Congress organisations, which shall furnish all information and give to the inspectors access to all offices and records.

(e) The Working Committee shall have the power—

(i) to frame rules and issue instructions for the proper working of the Constitution and in all matters not otherwise provided for;

(ii) to superintend, direct and control all Congress Committees subject to review by the A. I. C. C.

(iii) to take such disciplinary action as it may deem fit against a committee or individual for misconduct, wilful neglect or default.

(f) The Working Committee shall pay to the Provincial Congress Committee convening the Annual Session one-fifth of the fees recovered from the delegates within a fortnight of its termination.

(g) The Working Committee shall take steps to have a regular audit of the accounts of the Provincial Congress Committees.

FUNDS

ARTICLE XIII

The Treasurers shall be in charge of the funds of the Congress and shall keep proper accounts of all investments, income and expenditure.

GENERAL SECRETARIES

ARTICLE XIV

(a) The General Secretaries shall be in charge of the office of the A. I. C. C. and the Working Committee.

(b) The General Secretaries shall be responsible for the publication of the report of the proceedings of the Annual or Special Session in co-operation with the Provincial Committee concerned. Such report shall be published as soon as possible and not later than four months after the Session.

(c) The General Secretaries shall prepare the report of the work of the A. I. C. C. and the Working Committee during their period of office and submit it, with a full account of the funds which may have come into their hands, to the meeting of the A. I. C. C. immediately before the Annual Session.

VACANCIES

ARTICLE IV

The office of a delegate or a member of the A. I. C. C. or a Provincial Congress Committee shall be vacated by resignation, death or prolonged absence from India and such vacancy shall be filled by the Provincial Congress Committee concerned in the same manner in which the vacating member was chosen. A vacancy on the Working Committee shall be filled by the President.

FRACTIONS

ARTICLE XVI

Where there is a question of considering the value of fractions, a fraction of $\frac{1}{2}$ or more shall be treated as one, and less than $\frac{1}{2}$ as zero.

LANGUAGE

ARTICLE XVII

(a) The proceedings of the Congress, the All India Congress Committee and the Working Committee shall ordinarily be conducted in Hindustani; the English language or any provincial language may be used if the speaker is unable to speak in Hindustani or whenever permitted by the President.

(b) The proceedings of the Provincial Congress Committees shall ordinarily be conducted in the language of the province concerned. Hindustani may also be used.

TRANSITORY PROVISIONS

ARTICLE XVIII

(a) On these amendments to the Constitution coming into force the A. I. C. C. shall consist of not more than 166 members.

(b) The members of the Provincial Congress Committees which are functioning or are about to function shall, from among themselves, elect by single transferable vote the members of the A. I. C. C. mentioned in Clause (a).

(c) Where a Provincial Congress Committee at present consists of more than 100 members the sitting members of such Committee shall elect from among themselves by single transferable vote 100 members including the A. I. C. C. members to constitute the new Provincial Congress Committee under this Constitution.

(d) The Provincial Congress Committee reconstituted under Clause (c) shall elect its office-bearers.

(e) The votes at the elections under Clauses (b) and (c) may be recorded either at a meeting held for the purpose or on ballot papers sent by post.

(f) All such elections shall be held and a report thereon submitted to the Working Committee on or before the 15th of January 1935.

(g) Every Provincial Congress Committee shall, before the 28th of February 1935, submit for the approval of the Working Committee a report on the affairs of its province and

a draft constitution for the same not inconsistent with this Constitution and the rules made thereunder.

(h) The Provincial Constitutions shall come into operation on their being approved by the Working Committee.

(i) No Provincial Congress Committee and no subordinate Committee shall be recognised by the Working Committee unless it has complied with the conditions laid down in this Constitution or any rules framed thereunder by the Working Committee.

(j) On failure on the part of any Provincial Congress Committee to function in terms of the Constitution, the Working Committee may form one to carry on Congress work in that province.

(k) Notwithstanding Article III and V (a) and (b) (ii) a person otherwise duly qualified shall be eligible for election to an office or to membership of a Committee prior to 1st July 1935.

(l) Notwithstanding the provisions relating to the election of the President by the delegates under this Constitution, the President of the 48th Session of the Congress, viz., Sjt. Rajendra Prasad, shall continue to hold office as if he was elected hereunder.

(m) The President of the 48th Session of the Congress shall nominate fourteen members of the Working Committee including three General Secretaries and not more than two Treasurers from the members of the present A. I. C. C.

(n) The Working Committee may make such transitory regulations not inconsistent with the foregoing to meet any situation that may arise in the transitional period.

INDEX

Words in italics indicate names of periodicals.

Words within quotation indicate names of books.

PAGE	PAGE
A	
Absenteeism, Evils of ...	508
Acton on Ideals, Lord ...	794
Act of 1813, The ...	267
1833 ...	16, 270
Administration of Justice ...	642
Administrative reform ...	675
Agrarian problem ...	310
Agricultural Banks ...	488
" policy ...	439
Ahmedabad Congress, ...	
1902 ...	532
Ahmed, Sir Syed ...	743
" " on Indian ...	
agitation ...	275
Ajudhianath, Pandit ...	101
Allahabad Congress, 1888 ...	
George Yule's address ...	32
" Congress, 1892, W. C. ...	
Bonnerjee's address ...	96
" Wedderburn's address, ...	
1910 ...	859
Ameer Ali as Privy ...	
Councillor ...	839
Amraoti Congress, 1897, ...	
C. Sankaran Nair's ...	
address ...	318
Ananda Charlu ...	792
" President, Nagpur ...	
Congress, 1891 ...	80
Anarchical crimes ...	842
Anglo-Indians on Indian ...	
affairs ...	62
Appeal to Anglo-Indians ...	253
Appellate Court ...	112
Apres moi le deluge ...	651
Arms Act ...	167
" " and the ...	
Moslems ...	856
Army and Civil Services... ..	141
Asiatic poverty ...	510
Assessment in Mahratta ...	
and British regimes ...	635
Athalys of Bombay, Dr. ...	29
B	
Babu English ...	112
Bahadurji, Dr. ...	387
Baker, Sir Edward ...	825
" and the Regul- ...	
ations ...	821
Banerjee, Kali Charan ...	747
" Surendranath, ...	
President, ...	
Poona Con- ...	
gress, 1895 ...	179
" on Self-govern- ...	
ment ...	802
Barbour's note, Sir David ...	498
Bashyam Ayyengar, Sir... ..	792
Benares Congress, 1905, ...	
Gokhale's address ...	685
" Maharaja of ...	788
Bengal, Unrest in ...	752
Bilgrami, Syed Hussain, ...	
on Universities Com- ...	
mission Report ...	563
Biswambharnath, Pandit ...	747
Bombay agrarian legisla- ...	
tion ...	477
" association ...	732
" Congress, 1885, ...	
W. C. Bonnerji, ...	
President ...	1
" Congress, 1889, ...	
President Sir W. ...	
Wedderburn ...	48

PAGE	PAGE
Bombay Congress, 1904,	British sympathy with
Sir H Cotton ... 660	Mussulmans ... 281
Government, Famine	Budget, Dividing the
policy of ... 456	Council on the ... 313
Bonnerjee, W. C., President,	debate—a farce ... 200
Allahabad Congress,	in the Legislative
1892 ... 96	Councils ... 199
President, Bombay	Burke on Mandates ... 201
Congress, 1885 ... 1	Burns, John ... 823
Bose and Indian Associa-	
tion, Ananda Mohan 801	C
Madras Congress,	Caine's message, W. S. ... 390
1898 ... 339	Calcutta Congress, 1886,
Bose's Message, A. M. ... 390	1896, 1906,
Boycotting the adminis-	President,
tration ... 774	Dadabhai 5, 717
Bradlaugh, Charles 58, 81, 871	President
Bradlaugh's Indian	Sayani, 1896. 256
Councils Bill ... 69	1901, D. E.
services to India 65	Wacha,
Bright on the "diviner	President ... 448
thing" ... 723	Calcutta Municipal Bill ... 352
on Free traders ... 427	Municipality ... 399
on three kinds of	Cambridge Union Society 383
responsibility... 461	Campbell-Bannerman on
Bright's speech at Man-	Self-
chester Town Hall ... 299	govern-
British Cabinet and the	ment ... 734
House of Commons 107	Dictum
capital in India ... 673	of ... 723
Congress Com-	Capital on Home Charges 515
mittee 224, 776	640
fair play ... 159	Central Asian policy ... 215
justice and gene-	Finasbury, A
rosity, Faith in ... 250	message from ... 123
interest in Indian	Laboratory for
affairs ... 126	India ... 361
love of liberty ... 252	Chamberlain, The Birming-
non-official class	ham conjurer ... 629
on Indians ... 40	Chamberlain's Glasgow
policy in India ... 272	speech ... 369
power, Founda-	Chandavarkar, 1900,
tions of ... 152	Lahore Congress ... 424
rule, Advantages of 6	Chesney's "Indian Polity" 813
rule in India 617, 319	Churchill's letter to the
rule, Policy of ... 15	Treasury, Lord
sympathy with	Randolph ... 301
Indian aspirations 273	

	PAGE		PAGE
Chitral expedition ...	207	Congress work in London	155
" " —its		Constitution of Congress	185, 848
financial aspect	209	Constitutional agitation...	852
Civil and Military expenditure	225, 311	Co-operative credit societies	... 489
" " Medical services...	235	Cornwallis' settlement	... 637
Civil Service, Reconstitution of	... 677	Coronation of King Edward	... 451
Colvin, Sir Auckland	... 304	Cotton goods, Import duties on	... 218
Compulsory free education	... 652	Cotton, Sir Henry	... 871
"Conciliation":	... 861	" " on a "judicial scandal"	645
" Hindus and Mahomedans	... 865	" " on Indian economic problem...	673
" Moderates and Extremists	... 868	" " President, Bombay Congress,	1904 ... 660
" Officials and non-officials	... 862	Councils, Disqualifications for membership of	822
Congress achievements	64, 176, 251	" for N.-W. Provinces and Punjab...	13
" Agencies in London	... 55	Counsel of despair	... 773
" and Mussalmans	22, 63, 804	Court of Directors' views	269
" and social reform	10, 28, 98, 183	Courtney on Famine, Sir Leonard	... 469
" Constitution	185, 848	Cromer, Lord, on Poverty of India	... 217
" Creed, First article of the	393, 850	" Britain's Consul	... 669
" demands	... 761	" in Egypt	... 481
" Englishmen and	56	" on New India	... 669
" —Eurasians, Portuguese and	265	Cromer's estimate of Indian income	135, 139
" Future of the	... 130	Criminal cases between Europeans and Indians	... 239
" Leaders' declarations	... 259	" procedure in India	171
" movement	48, 180	Cross's India Bill	61, 67, 87
" of educated natives	... 23	Currency, Artificial	... 513
" Origin of the	... 256	" and national debt	413
" Presidents	... 264	" question	... 148
" programme	... 266	Curzon, Lord	341, 756
" resolutions: the case for India	872	" on Famine	... 400
" Why it exists?	770		
" work in England	246, 382, 776		

	PAGE		PAGE
Curzon, Obiter dicta of ...	501	Diamond Jubilee of	
Curzon's administration,		Queen Victoria ...	317
Gokhale on Lord ...	687	Dilke on the Congress,	
farewell speech... ..	689	Sir Charles ...	78
" ill-services to		Disraeli on the Expan-	
India ...	816	sion of Councils ...	102
" Viceroyalty, Exten-		Disqualifications for	
sion of Lord ...	482	membership of Councils	822
		District Boards ...	416
		Divide and rule policy ...	752
		Division in Congress	
		Camp ...	770
		Drain, The ...	595
		Drink Traffic ...	173
		Dufferin, Lord ...	14, 89
		" and the Congress	44, 272
		Dutt, R. C. ...	797
		" " Presidential	
		address,	
		Lucknow,	
		1899 ...	390
		" " Scheme of	379, 644
		E	
		<i>East & West</i> , Gaekwar	
		in the ...	552
		Economic Problem ...	568
		Economy in administra-	
		tion ...	444
		Educate the masses ...	92
		Educated classes ...	365
		" Indians and	
		the Reforms	830
		" natives—Are	
		they disloyal?	25
		Education Commissions...	548
		" Compulsory Free	652
		" Hodgson Pratt on	710
		" of the Peoples ...	173
		" More revenue for	110
		Educational service,	
		Reorganisation of ...	344
		Edward, Coronation of	
		King ...	451
		" Jubilee message	
		of King ...	860

D

Dacca People's Associ-	
ation ...	654
Dadabhai Naoroji, Presi-	
dent, Calcutta	
Congress 1886,	
1906 ...	5, 717
" in Commons...	105
" Lahore Con-	
gress, 1893 ...	120
" the Indian	
Member of the	
Commons 127, 156	
" on Poverty of	
India ...	216
" on Pledged	
rights ...	721
" on Swaraj ...	724
Dadabhai's dictum ...	806
" election to British	
Parliament 127, 156	
Dalhousie, Lord ...	397
Dharbanga, Maharajah of	
386	
391	
Deccan Agriculturists'	
Relief Act ...	490
Decentralisation Com-	
mittee ...	765
Declarations of Congress	
leaders ...	259
Delhi Durbar ...	536
Despatch of 1880, 1886	
8, 136	
Deportation and the	
Partition ...	845
Deportations ...	748
Deputation to the Viceroy	
(Lord Hardinge). ...	871
Devonshire, Duke of ...	133

	PAGE
Egyptian system ...	490
Elliott on Famine expenditure, Sir Charles ...	466
Elphinstone on Administration by foreigners ...	668
Elphinstone's views ...	268
<i>Empire Review</i> , Mr. Kopsch in the ...	515
Employment of people, Wider ...	597
Enemies of England? Who are the ...	760
England and India ...	294, 664
" Trust in ...	12, 251
English officials and India ...	163
Englishmen and the Congress ...	56
Exchange compensation allowance ...	220
Excise and education ...	244
Executive and judicial functions ...	237
" Councils in the Provinces ...	811
" Councils, Reform of the ...	372
Expenditure, Reduction of ...	837
Europeans and the Congress ...	117
" and Indian aspirations ...	27

F

Facts from the blue books ...	38
Famine and poverty ...	305, 325
" Causes of ...	403
" Charles Elliott on ...	466
" Codes and prevention of famine ...	461
" Commission, First ...	441
" " of 1879 and 1898 ...	503
" " of 1901... ...	578
" " recommendations of ...	467
" Effects of ...	453
" of 1897 ...	395
" of 1899 ...	402, 426

Famine, Lord Curzon on... ..	432
" policy of Bombay Government ...	456
" policy, State ...	427
" relief fund ...	455
" State and private relief to ...	454
Famines ...	572
Fawcett in the Commons ...	300
Financial relations between England and India ...	730
" result of British administration ...	301
First national assembly... ..	1
Foodstocks, Statistics of ...	308
Foreign policy and Indian Finance ...	327
Forest Service, Indian ...	148
Forward policy, Effects of ...	360
Free Press ...	271
" trade and protection ...	629
Frere on Educated Indians, Sir Bartle ...	8, 124
Frontier policy ...	210
" War, Cost of ...	355

G

Gaekwar of Baroda ...	552
Gandhi and South Africa ...	867
General election, Opportunities of a ...	666
Ghose, Lal Mohan ...	797
" Madras Congress, 1903 ...	620
" Mano Mohan ...	314
" Rash Behari, Madras Congress, 1908 ...	779
" " Surat Congress, 1907 ...	745
Gladstone, Mr. ...	271, 299, 339, 387
" on Indian Councils Bill ...	73
" on Living representation ...	191

	PAGE		PAGE
Gladstone on the Opium debate ...	134	Hindus and Mahomedans	228
" on Real representation ...	132	" History of India ", Orme's ...	658
Gokhale, Benares Congress address, 1905 ...	685	" " of the Indian Peoples " by Sir, William Hunter ...	166
" on Lord Curzon	687	Home Charges ...	225
" on Lord Minto	686	" " and Indian finance ...	213
" on our immediate demands	712	" " Apportionment of ...	216
Gokhale's picture of Lord Curzon	687, 786	Hume's services to India	82
" protest re : Kelkar ...	824	Hunter, Sir W. ...	217
Golden age of Indian reformers ...	670	" " on India ...	274
Government and Native States ...	150	" " on Mahomedan influence ...	280
" of India's Extravagance	626	Hunter's " History of the Indian Peoples " ...	166
Grain Storage ...	492	I	
Grant, in the House of Commons, Sir Charles	270	Impatient idealist	873
" Sir Charles, on Indian conditions	267	Imperial and Advisory Councils ...	809
<i>Greenwich Observer</i> on free trade and protection ...	629	" Unity, Benefits of	165
Gujarat inquiry ...	460	Imperial Cadet Corps ...	601
H		Import duties on Cotton goods ...	218
Hardinge, Deputation to Lord ...	871	<i>India</i> —Congress organ	156
Hardinge's Message, Lord	861	India, Injustice to ...	358
Hastings' views ...	268	" Poverty in ...	18
Hartington in the Commons, Lord ...	300	" Bill: How it works? ...	35
Hewett's opposition to Councils, Sir John	814	" " Origin of the ...	33
Higher careers for Indians	838	India's birthright ...	719
<i>Hindu</i> and the first Congress ...	2	" claims to all competitive examinations ...	233
Hindu Minorities in the Punjab ...	819	" constitutional struggle ...	616
" -Muslim Rapprochement ...	658	" fabulous wealth ...	19
		" faith in England ...	76
		" financial position	204
		" future, The ideal of	671
		" loyalty to British throne	249, 337
		" opponents in England ...	5

	PAGE		PAGE
India's political future ...	338	Indians in Executive Councils ...	811
" share in fighting for the Empire ...	214	" in public services ...	226
Indian affairs in England ...	49	" in South Africa ...	840
" agitation in England ...	777	" in Transvaal ...	681
<i>Indian Agriculturist</i> on Agriculture in Canada and Ireland ...	443	Industrial development ...	222, 440, 523
Indian Association of Calcutta ...	801	" regeneration ...	771
" budget debate ...	131	Interpellation in Councils ...	195
" " in the Commons ...	75	Irrigation vs. Railways ...	484
" Civil Service, Merits of the ...	864	Ireland and India ...	143
" Councils Act, 1892. 193, Bill ...	67, 73	Islam, Principles of ...	291
" delegates in England ...	73		
" Finance and Home Charges ...	213	J	
" Famine Union ...	469	Jackson, Mr. ...	842
" " " Recommendations of ...	476	Japan, The lesson of ...	835
" finance ...	512	Jingoism, A reflex ...	639
" Government ...	350	Jethmal, Dayaram ...	29
" loyalty ...	140	Jubilee of the Queen ...	9
" National Congress ...	867	Judicial and executive functions ...	377, 602
" nationality ...	166	" " scandal, Sir H. Cotton ...	645
" party in the Commons ...	89	Jury Bill ...	239
" policy and British policy ...	176	" Notification ...	241
" political progress ...	60	Justice, Administration of ...	642
" polity" by Gen. Chesney ...	813		
" questions as Party questions in England ...	248	K	
" representation in Parliament ...	132	Kelkar, and Bombay Council election, N. C. ...	824
" <i>Spectator</i> and the first Congress ...	2	Kimberley's decision, Lord ...	122
" taxpayer ...	145		
Indians before law, Equality of ...	328	L	
" —heirs of a better hope ...	47	Lajpat Rai, Lala ...	748, 823, 845
		Lahore Congress, Chanda-varkar, 1900 ...	424
		" " Dadabhai, 1893 ...	120
		" " Malaviya's address, 1909 ...	796
		Lalkaka, Dr. ...	842
		Land Alienation Bill ...	437
		" Assessments in the Provinces ...	405

	PAGE		PAGE
Land Assessments, Lord		Macaulay on Agitation ...	738
Salisbury on ...	474	" on India's trade	139
Land revenue ...	309	" on Indian edu-	
" Amendment Act	479	cation ...	270
" assessment ...	586	" on the policy of	
" settlement ...	438	British rule ...	15
" settlement, Mr.		Macaulay's prophecy ...	72
Smeaton on ...	637	Mackarness, Mr. ...	846
" system ...	429	Maclean, Sir Francis ...	368
Landsdowne on Macaulay's		Madhava Rao, Sir T. ...	44, 29
prophecy ...	72	Madras Congress, 1887	
Law on Economic pro-		President,	
gress, Sir Edward...	506	Badraddin Tyabji ...	21
" of sedition, The new	350	Congress, 1894	
Lawrence on the Poverty		" President, Alfred	
of India, Lord ...	299	Webb ...	160
Lawrence's advice, Lord	212	" Congress, 1898,	
Lawson, Sir Wilfred ...	859	President	
Leaders and followers ...	662	A. M. Bose	339
Legal Practitioners' Bill	239	" Municipal Bill ...	654
Legislative Councils,		Magna Charta ...	16
" " Enlarge-		Mahomedan deputation	
ment of 17, 678		to Lord Minto...	808
" Councils,		" education ...	293
Reconsti-		" moral code ...	294
tution of	108	Mahomedans and the	
" " Reform of	32	Congress ...	63, 282, 804
Liberal friends of India...	248	Majitia, Sirdar Dyal	
London Congress ...	158	Singh ...	386
" " Work in	155	Malaviya, Lahore Con-	
Lucknow Congress, Dutt's		gress, 1909 ...	796
address, 1899 ...	390	Malcolm's views, Sir John	269
Lynch in the Boer War		Masses, Condition of the	
and after, Mr. ...	823	495, 503	
Lytton and Ripon, Lords	802	Mckinley, The late Mr.	450
Lytton's confidential docu-		Mehta, Calcutta Congress,	
ment ...	707	Pheroze Shah, 1890 ...	59
" maladministra-		Members for India ...	664
tion ...	801	Military expenditure	143, 205,
" Proclamation ...	540	413, 518	
" Repudiation of		" programme, Ex-	
Land Amend-		pensive ...	212
ment Act ...	479	" Service ...	600
M			
Macaulay and the Act of		" " and Colle-	
1833 ...	726	ges for Indians	234
" and the Charter		Mill on Representative	
Act ...	189	Government ...	250

	PAGE		PAGE
Milner on Egyptian Loyalists, Lord ...	787	National debt ...	413
Minorities, Hindu ...	819	" ideal ...	854
Minto, Lord ...	686	" spirit, Growth of ...	667
" Mahomedan deputa- tion to Lord ...	808	" wealth ...	496
" -Morley scheme .	783	Natu Brothers, Deporta- tion of ...	333
Minto's legacy ...	807	New Imperialism ...	612
" reply to deputa tion, Lord ...	817	" party, appeal to ...	775
Mirror and the first Congress, The ...	2	" " and Constitu- tional agita- tion ..	772
Mitra, Dr. Rajendra Lal...	84	" " Growth of the ...	760
Mitter, Sir R. C. ...	391	" spirit in India ...	764
Mofussil bar, Inde- pendence of the ..	241	Newspapers—Indian and English ...	398
Moghul and Mahratta methods of revenue collection ...	637	Nineteenth Century on Military expenditure ...	205
Moir's views ...	268	Non-official majorities ...	824
Money-lenders and law courts ...	435	Northbrook on Indian Councils Bill Lord ...	70
Mockerjee, G. B. ...	29	O	
Morison, Prof. ...	368	Official Mandate Theory ...	201
Morley, Mr John ...	757	Opium traffic ..	175
" and Minto ...	800	Orange River Colony ...	608
" at the Palmerston Club ...	734	Orme's "History of India" ...	658
" on Political prin- ciples ...	724	Oxford Union Society ...	384
" Reforms of ...	765, 783	P	
Morley's budget speech, 1907 ...	809	Panchayat system ..	117
" Despatch ...	810	Parekh, Hon. Mr ...	460
Moslem League ...	818, 854, 855	Parliament, Indian ques- tions in ...	128
Municipal towns ...	416	" Functions of ...	665
Mussulmans and English education ...	302	" Representa- tion in ...	18
" Congress and ...	22	" What it does ...	36
N		Parliamentary Commit- tees of Enquiry ...	223
Nagpur Congress, 1891, P. Ananda Charlu ...	80	" control ..	51
Natal, British Indians in ...	607	" interest in India ...	164
Natesan's handy volume on the "Congress" ...	867	Partition of Bengal ...	680,
" publications, Dutt on ...	393	689, 846	
		" —a festering sore ...	757
		" —a settled fact but an unsettled question ...	791

	PAGE		PAGE
Pax Britannica	... 634	Public Services, Employ-	
Permanent settlement	406, 637	ment in the	... 725
Persia, Tibet and	... 641	Punjab, Grievances of the	847
Pioneer on the Indian		" Land Alienation	
Student	... 564	Bill	... 403
Plague operations	... 385	" Unrest in the	... 758
Pledged rights, Dadabhai		Punjab's responsibility	... 121
on	... 721		
Police, The	... 604	R	
" Reform of the	... 380	Racial harmony	... 151
Political institutions on a		Railways	<i>versus</i>
wider basis	... 37	Irrigation	... 484
Politics? What are	... 167	Ramaswami Mudaliar,	
Pompous pageant to a		Salem	... 103
perishing people, A	... 625	Ranade	122, 182, 448
Poona Congress, 1895,		" on England's	
President Surendranath Banerjee	179	domination	... 699
" Plague operations	330	" on true end of our	
Poverty and high prices...	832	work	... 716
" of India	133, 168, 216, 223	Rawalpindi case	... 749
" " British		Reform of Legislative	
opinions		Councils	32, 104, 130, 170, 191, 804
on	299	Reforms and Educated	
Pratt on Western Educa-		Indians	... 830
tion	710	" Leading features	
Presidents of the Congress,		of	... 783
Former	... 161	" Financial aspect	
Press Act	... 788	of	... 378
" prosecutions	... 751	Regulation III of 1818	... 748
Princes, The position of the	627	Regulations, The	... 817
Proclamation of 1858	272, 721	" Objections to	820
Propaganda in England	871	" Public dis-	
Prosecutions for Sedition	789	satisfaction	
Provincial Councils,		with the	... 832
Reform of	... 769	Representation in Parlia-	
" decentralisation	836	ment	18, 373
" Executive		" Right of	... 728
Councils	812, 419	" to Mahomed-	
" Legislative		ans, Direct	... 819
Councils	418	Right of interpellation	... 196
Public Service Commission		Ripon and Lytton, Lords	802
13, 614		" and Morley's	
" " Report of	231	Scheme, Lords	... 800
" " question	... 228	" —Best of our	
		Viceroys	... 49
		" Death of Lord	... 799

Tata's munificence	...	386
Taxation and artificial currency	...	513
„ Remission of	...	588
Teaching Universities	...	565
Technical and industrial education	...	835
„ education	...	362
Telang, Justice	..	122
Thackersay on Village industries Sir V.	...	703
Tilak, Imprisonment of	...	334
„ Release of	...	385
Tibet and Persia	...	641
„ Financial control in	679	
<i>Times</i> , The	564,	567
<i>Times of India</i> , The	301,	483
Trade between Britain and India	...	138
Trial by jury	...	171
„ in Bengal	...	111
„ • System of	...	244

	PAGE		PAGE
Turgot's letter to		W	
Louis XVI	... 521	Wacha's address.	
Tyabji, Badruddin	... 741	Calcutta, 1901	... 448
" President, Madras		"Watchwords", Sir	
Congress, 1887	... 21	William Wedderburn's	860
U		What Indians really	
U. P., Executive Council		want	43, 61
for	... 814	Webb, Madras Congress.	
Universities Commission	542	1894	... 160
" Commission		Wedderburn, Sir William,	
Report of the	649	Allahabad	
" Constitution of	567	Congress,	
Unrest in Bengal	... 752	1910	... 859
Unrest in the Punjab	... 758	" Bombay	
V		Congress	
Venkata Subbarayudu, S.	30	1889	... 48
Viceroy's Council	... 419	" and the	
" Executive		Indian Civil	
Council, Reform		Service	... 50
of	... 768	" on Famine	469
Victoria, Queen	... 449	Welby, Lord	... 304
" Diamond Jubilee	315, 318	" Commission and	
Victoria's letter to Lord		Indian Witnesses	324
Derby	... 721	Western influence on the	
" Proclamation	721	East	... 674
Village industries	... 703	" influence on	
" Unions	414	India	... 323
Vox populi vox dei	... 624	Wingate, Sir George	... 300
		Y	
		Yule, George, President.	
		Allahabad Congress, 1888	32
		Yule's view of Parliamen-	
		tary Control	... 87

UNIFORM WITH THIS VOLUME

Congress Presidential Addresses

FROM THE SILVER TO THE GOLDEN JUBILEE

Second Series from 1911 to 1934.

This Volume contains full text of the Addresses of the following Presidents of the Congress, from 1911 down to this day:—

Pt Bishan Narayan Dhar	Hakim Ajmal Khan
R. N. Mudholkar	Deshabandu C. R. Das
Nawab Syed Mohammed	Moulana Mohamed Ali
Babu Bhupendranath Basu	Mahatma Gandhi
Sir S. P. Sinha	Mrs Sarojini Naidu
Amvica Charan Mazumdar	Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar
Mrs. Annie Besant	Dr M. A. Ansari
Pt. M. Mohan Malaviya	Pandit Motilal Nehru
Pandit Motilal Nehru	Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru
C. Vijayaraghavachariar	Sardar Vallabhai Patel

Babu Rajendra Prasad

SELECT PRESS OPINIONS

The Hitavada:—"This well-printed volume of nearly a thousand pages should give the student of Indian national history a fine guide for his study of the changing phase of Indian nationalism."

Federated India:—"The book is a welcome publication and enables persons not acquainted with India to understand what India wants."

Hindustan Review:—"They form an interesting historical record of the politics of the country, with a good deal of creative criticism of the present-day politics."

The Industry (Calcutta):—"The book not only records the evolution of thoughts and dictum in the Congress circles from year to year but also makes a running commentary on the administration of the country."

Crown 8vo. Nearly a Thousand Pages

Indexed and Cloth Bound.

PRICE RUPEES FOUR

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review", Rs. 3-8.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

VALMIKI RAMAYANA

CONDENSED IN THE POET'S OWN WORDS

Text in Devanagari and English Translation

BY VIDYASAGARA-VIDYAVACHASPATI

PROF. P. P. S. SASTRI, B.A., (OXON.), M.A.

FOREWORD

BY

THE RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI,

P.C., C.H., LL.D.

Mr. Natesan, who published over a quarter of a century ago a popular edition of the Bhagavad Gita and also of the Select Works of Sri Sankaracharya with the text in Devanagari and an English translation, has now enriched Indian classical literature with another valuable publication quite unique in character. He has succeeded in the almost impossible task of presenting a condensed version in the poet's own words of the immortal Indian epic Valmiki Ramayana. The story is told by the poet himself; the passages placed before the reader are selected passages from the poem itself. We have the story of the epic in full, together with the renowned dialogues, the beautiful character sketches and the many inimitable descriptions. There is nothing in this abridgment which is not Valmiki's.

It is sincerely hoped that this popular edition of the Great Indian Epic will find its way to thousands of homes in India and elsewhere and will find favour with the students of our schools and colleges.

Price Re. 1/4.

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review", Re. 1.

Foreign 2sh. Postage 8d.

Books are given at concession rates only to subs. of the "Indian Review". Any one who wishes to buy books at concession rates must remit Rs. 5 (Five) one year's subscription to the "Indian Review" in advance. Foreign Subscriptions: Great Britain 12 sh. (Twelve Shillings), U S. A. 3 Dollars.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

THE INDIAN REVIEW

A Cyclopaedia of India

1900 to 1935

A RECORD OF 35 YEARS

An account of the many-sided activities of India in the Political, Economical, Industrial, Agricultural, Religious, and Social life of the country; Biographical and critical sketches of the prominent men and women who have played an active part in the making of modern India. You have all this in the volumes of the *Indian Review* commencing from 1900. Cloth bound and indexed. In these volumes you have a copious and entertaining record of the history of the last thirty-five years contributed by a host of writers, European and Indian, scholars, officials and non-officials, politicians, and social reformers.

**Useful for all Libraries, Educational
and Public Institutions**

Sir (Prof.) Jadunath Sirkar, C.I.E.—"I have been greatly helped by the old files of the *Indian Review* which contains a large fund of accurate information on Indian economic questions not to be easily gathered elsewhere."

THE INDIAN REVIEW

BOUND ANNUAL VOLUMES

for the following years are available:—

1902	1907	1911	1915	1919	1923	1927	1931
1903	1908	1912	1916	1920	1924	1928	1932
1905	1909	1913	1917	1921	1925	1929	1933
1906	1910	1914	1918	1922	1926	1930	1934

RUPEES EIGHT PER VOLUME

A few back volumes of the *Review* neatly bound in calico with index for the above-mentioned years are available. Orders should be accompanied with an advance of Rs. 10.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

THE DHAMMAPADA

OR

THE WAY OF TRUTH

Translated from the Original Pali

BY S. W. WIJAYATILAKE

The Dhammapada, though a work of small proportions, is one of the greatest books of the Buddhist World, and occupies in Buddhism the same unique position as the **Bhagavat Gita** does in Hinduism. Like the **Bhagavat Gita**, the **Dhammapada** enjoys the same popularity.

Like the **Bhagavat Gita**, which embodies the essence of Hinduism, the **Dhammapada** gives in outline the Buddha's teaching on the ethical and practical side, a fact which makes it a constant guide and companion to the student of Buddhism. Many a convert to Buddhism traces his or her conversion to the **Dhammapada**.

The present translation, like the translation of the **Bhagavat Gita**, is intended for the ordinary reader, and it is hoped it will be appreciated by such.

PRICE ANNAS EIGHT.

To Subscribers of "Indian Review", Annas 6.

Books are given at concession rates only to subscribers of the Indian Review. Any one who wishes to buy books at concession rates must remit Rs. 5 (12sh. Foreign) one year's subscription to the "Review" in advance.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

THE GREAT TRIAD

Texts in Devanagari and English Translation.

The Srimad Bhagavata. Condensed in sage Vyasa's own words by Pandit A. M. Srinivasachari. Translated into English by Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., Ph.D. With a Foreword by Dr. Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer.

The Ramayana. Condensed in Valmiki's own words by Pandit A. M. Srinivasachari. Translated into English by Prof. P. P. S. Sastri, B.A. (Oxon.), M.A. With a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. Dr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.C., C.H.

The Mahabharata. Condensed in sage Vyasa's own words by Pandit A. M. Srinivasachari. Translated into English by Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., Ph.D. With a Foreword by Dr. Sir S. Radhakrishnan.

SELECT OPINIONS

Prof. A. Berriedale Keith :—"It is a most ingenious idea to condense into such brief compass the contents of these three great works and to give these summaries, together with English renderings. This difficult undertaking has been most successfully carried through, and I trust that the books will serve the purpose of making accessible the essential substance of the texts to a wide range of readers."

Dr. G. H. Mees, M.A., LL.D. :—"Given in the poet's own words (text in Devanagari), carefully compiled and translated by the foremost of scholars into simple and good English, they will form a source of joy to the thorough knower of the epics as well as to the person who reads them for the first time, to the orthodox as much as to the modern, for youth as well as for riper age, for the Western reader as much as for the Eastern."

THREE UNIFORM VOLUMES. **Price Re. 1-4 each.**

To Subscribers of the *Indian Review*, Re. One each.

Foreign 2sh. each. Postage 8d. each.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books are given at concession rates only to subscribers of the Indian Review. Any one who wishes to buy books at concession rates must remit Rs. Five (12sh. Foreign) one year's subscription to the "Review" in advance.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

SRIMAD BHAGAVATA

CONDENSED IN THE POET'S OWN WORDS
Text in Devanagari and English Translation.

COMPILED BY

PANDIT A. M. SRINIVASACHARIAR

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH BY

DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., Ph.D.

WITH A FOREWORD BY

DR. SIR P. S. SIVASWAMY AIYER

This edition contains an account of the Avataras of the Lord and the stories of Dhruva, Priyavrata, Jadabharata, Vritrasura, Ajamila, Gajendramoksha, etc., etc.; also all the important episodes in the life of the Lord Krishna—the killing of Kamsa, the marriage of Rukmini, the story of Kuchela, the famous discourse to Uddhava, the passing of the Lord and the salvation of King Parikshit.

Dr. Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer says in the Foreword :—“ We find in the Bhagavata the highest truths of religion and philosophy and the highest principles of ethics. The lilt of the verse in the Bhagavata has a peculiar charm of its own. There is a solemnity and grandeur in the devotional songs which attunes the mind to the high theme. No other work in the Hindu religious literature has made a more careful study of the psychology of Bhakti.”

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE

Valmiki Ramayana

The Mahabharata

Price Re. 1-4 each.

To Subscribers of the *Indian Review*, Re. One.

Foreign 2sh. each. Postage 8d.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & Co., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

VALMIKI RAMAYANA

CONDENSED IN THE POET'S OWN WORDS

Text in Devanagari and English Translation.

COMPILED BY

PANDIT A. M. SRINIVASACHARIAR

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH BY

PROF. P. P. S. SASTRI, B.A. (OXON), M.A.

WITH A FOREWORD BY

THE RT. HON. SRINIVASA SASTRI, P.C., C.H., LL.D.

“ Mr. Natesan, who published over a quarter of a century ago a popular edition of the Bhagavad Gita and also of the Select Works of Sri Sankaracharya with the text in Devanagari and an English translation, has now enriched Indian classical literature with another valuable publication quite unique in character. He has succeeded in the almost impossible task of presenting a condensed version in the poet's own words of the immortal Indian epic *Valmiki Ramayana*. The story is told by the poet himself; the passages placed before the reader are selected passages from the poem itself. We have the story of the epic in full together with the renowned dialogues, the beautiful character sketches and the many inimitable descriptions.”

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE

Srimad Bhagavata

The Mahabharata

Price Re. 1-4 each.

To Subs. of the *Indian Review*, Re. One each.

Foreign 2sh. each. Postage 8d.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & Co., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

THE MAHABHARATA

CONDENSED IN THE POET'S OWN WORDS

Text in Devanagari and English Translation

COMPILED BY

PANDIT A. M. SRINIVASACHARIAR

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH

By DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., Ph.D.

FOREWORD BY

PROF. SIR S. RADHAKRISHNAN

The great epic of Sage Vyasa has been admirably condensed in this handy book. The thread of the main story is seen here clearly together with the best portions of the dialogues and the discourses. Indeed, it is Vyasa himself speaking, not the compiler.

Neither the ignorance of Sanskrit nor the mammoth-size of the original need now stand in the way of any one enjoying the immortal epic of Vyasa.

Dr. Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar, K.C.S.I., C.S.I., C.I.E., (in a letter to Mr. G. A. Natesan):—"You must be congratulated on your attempt to condense the most unwieldy and voluminous Epic in the world. . . The translation is accurate and readable and reflects credit upon the translator, Dr. V. Raghavan."

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE

Valmiki Ramayana Srimad Bhagavata

Re. 1-4. each. To Subs. of "I.R.", Re. 1. each.

Foreign 2sh. each. Postage 9d.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

SANKARA'S SELECT WORKS

SANSKRIT TEXT & ENGLISH TRANSLATION

BY MR. S. VENKATARAMANAN, B.A.

CONTENTS: Hymn to Hari; The Ten-Versed Hymn; Hymn to Dakshinamurti; Direct Realisation; The Century of Verses; Knowledge of Self; Commentary on the Text; Definition of one's own Self.

"His (Sankara's) philosophy stands forth complete, needing neither a before nor an after. It has a self-justifying wholeness characteristic of works of art."—*Sir S. Radhakrishnan*.

Rs. Two. To Subs. of "I.R." Re. 1-8 as.

Foreign Three Shillings. Postage 9d.

ASPECTS OF THE VEDANTA

A SYMPOSIUM BY DISTINGUISHED WRITERS

CONTENTS :—The Vedanta: Some reasons for its study by Mr. N. Vythinatha Aiyar, M.A.; Veda and the Vedanta by Prof. Max Muller; Vedanta toward all religions by Swami Abhedananda; the Vedanta in outline by Pandit Sitanath Tattvabhushan; the Vedanta Religion by Prof. M. Rangachariar, M.A.; the ethics of the Vedanta I by Swami Saradananda; II. by Mr. N. Vythinatha Aiyar, M.A.; III. by Vasudeva J. Kirtikar; the Philosophy of the Vedanta by Dr. Paul Deussen; the Vedanta Philosophy by Swami Vivekananda; the Vedantic Doctrine of the future life by Pandit Sitanath Tattvabhushan; the Vedanta: its theory and practice by Swami Saradananda; the Vedanta for the world by Swami Vivekananda; Vedanta in daily life by Swami Abhedananda. New Edition.

Re. 1. To Subs. of the "Indian Review", As. 12.

Foreign 1sh. 6d. Postage 4d.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

Swami Vivekananda's

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

This is an exhaustive and comprehensive collection of the works of Swami Vivekananda. It contains, among others, his eloquent character-sketch of "My Master", his celebrated lectures at the great Parliament of Religions at Chicago and other addresses.

7th Edition. Rs. 3. To Subs. of the "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

Foreign 4sh. 6d. Postage 1sh. 6d.

The Mission of our Master

Essays and Discourses by Vivekananda, Abhedananda, Trigunatita, Bodhananda, Virajananda, Nivedita, Miss Waldo, Brahmananda, Saradananda, Turyananda, Kripananda, Sharvananda, Devamata, Paramananda, Ramakrishnananda.

Rs. 3. To Subs. of the "Indian Review", Rs. 2-8.

Foreign 4sh. 6d. Postage 1sh. 4d.

Ramanand to Ram Tirath

Contains the lives and teachings of the Saints of Northern India from Ramanand to Ram Tirath.

Price Re. 1-8. To Subs. of the "I.R." Re. 1-4.

Chaitanya to Vivekananda

It is the ancient philosophy of the Hindus that finds varied utterance in the discourses of Chaitanya, the poems of Ramprasad, the sayings of Ramakrishna, Paramahansa and the speeches of Vivekananda.

Price Re. 1-8. To Subs. of the "I.R." Re. 1-4.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

HINDU RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

The Srimad Bhagavata. (Condensed in Sage Vyasa's own words.) Text in Devanagari and English Translation. Compiled by Pandit A. M. Srinivasa-chariar. Translated by Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., Ph.D. Foreword by Dr. Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar. Re. 1-4. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review", Re. One.

The Mahabharata. (Condensed in Sage Vyasa's own words.) Text in Devanagari and English Translation. Compiled by Pandit A. M. Srinivasa-chariar. Translated by Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., Ph.D. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review", Re. One.

Valmiki Ramayana. (Condensed in the Poet's own words.) The text in Devanagari and English translation by Prof. P. P. S. Sastri. With a Foreword by the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, F.C., C.H. Re. 1-4. To Subs of "I.R." Re. 1.

Sankara's Select Works. Text in Devanagari and English translation. Rs. 2. To Subs. "I.R." Re. 1-8.

Bhagavad Gita. Text in Devanagari and translation by Dr. Besant in English. As. 4 (Four).

Swami Vivekananda's Speeches and Writings. 7th Edn. Re. 3. To Subs. of "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

The Mission of Our Master. Essays and Discourses. By Eastern and Western disciples. Re. 3. To Subs. of the "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

Aspects of the Vedanta. By various writers. 5th Edition. Re. 1. To Subs. of "I.R." As. 12.

Hindu Ethics. By Babu Govinda Das. Rs. 2. To Subs. of "I.R." Re. 1-8.

Chaitanya to Vivekananda. Lives of the saints of Bengal. Re. 1-8. To Subs. "I.R." Re. 1-4.

Ramanand to Ram Tirath. Lives of the Saints of N. India. Re. 1-8. To Subs. "I.R." Re. 1-4.

Three Great Acharyas. Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhwa. Rs. 2. To Subs. of "I.R." Re. 1-8.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.
Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS..

THE WORLD TEACHERS

Life and Teachings of Zoroaster

BY PROF. A. R. WADIA, M.A.

(of the Mysore University)

This book gives a very clear account of the life of Zoroaster and his Teachings. The author bases his observations on works in the ancient Avestan language, the *Gathas* and other Pahlavi literature.

Price Annas Twelve.

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review", As. 10.

Life and Teachings of Buddha

BY THE ANAGARIKA DHARMAPALA

A clear and concise account of the life and teachings of Lord Buddha by a great Buddhist authority.

Price As. 12. To Subs. of "I. R.", As. 10.

Life and Teachings of Muhammad

BY AHMED SHAFI AND YAKUB HASAN

In this brief sketch an attempt is made to present an outline of the chief incidents that marked the career of a great world-personality. The Teachings of the Prophet will be particularly interesting.

Price As. 12. To Subs. of the "I.R.", As. 10.

Foreign Price 1sh. 6d. each. Postage 7d. each.
Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

*In Preparation.*¹

Krishna—Christ.

G. A. NATEŞAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

NATESAN'S NATIONAL LITERATURE

17 UNIFORM CLOTH-BOUND VOLUMES

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS OF

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA
RAJA RAM MOHUN ROY
SAROJINI NAIDU
SIR J. C. BOSE
DR. P. C. RAY

DR. ANNIE BESANT
SIR WM. WEDDERBURN
MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA
SIR DINSHAW WACHA
LORD SINHA

Each Vol. Rs. 3. To Subs. of "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE

Indian Judges. Biographical and critical sketches of twenty-one eminent High Court Judges. Rs. 3.

Famous Parsis. Biographical sketches of politicians, philanthropists, captains of Industry, etc. Rs. 3.

Eminent Mussulmans. Biographical sketches of Muslim Statesmen, Poets, Reformers, etc. Rs. 3.

Indian Christians. Biographical sketches of Poets, Publicists, Ministers of the Church, etc. Rs. 3.

Indian Statesmen. Biographical sketches of famous Dewans and Prime Ministers of Indian States. Rs. 3.

Indian Scientists. Biographical sketches with an account of their Researches, etc. Rs. 3.

Mission of Our Master. By the Disciples of Ramakrishna and Vivekananda. Rs. 3.

To Subs. of "Indian Review", Rs. 2-8 each.

Foreign 4sh. 6d. each. Postage 1sh. 6d. each.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

Books are given at concession rates only to subscribers of the "Indian Review". Any one who wishes to buy books at concession rates must remit Rs. Five (12sh. Foreign) one year's subscription in advance.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

MAHATMA GANDHI'S SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

This omnibus edition of Mahatma Gandhi's Speeches and Writings is revised and considerably enlarged with the addition of a number of important articles from *Young India* and *Narajivan* (rendered into English) on the Non-Co-operation Movement. It also includes Mahatma Gandhi's famous letters to the three Viceroy's—Lord Chelmsford, Lord Reading and Lord Irwin, his historic Statement before the Court at the great trial, his Congress Presidential Address and the full text of his agreement with Lord Irwin and the Speeches implementing the Pact. Then there are his Speeches at the Second Round Table Conference and the Willingdon-Gandhi correspondence. Over 1100 pages. With Illustrations and an Index.

Cloth Bound. Fourth Edition. Rs. 4.

To Subs. of the "Indian Review", Rs. 3-8.

Foreign 6sh. Postage 1sh. 6d.

MAHATMA GANDHI: THE MAN AND HIS MISSION

This is an enlarged Edition of Mr. Gandhi's life and teachings, with an account of his activities in South Africa and India, a sketch of the Non-Co-operation Movement, the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, the Rupture and the agreement with Lord Willingdon.

Re. 1. To Subs. of the "Indian Review", As. 12.

Foreign 1sh. 6d. Postage 4d.

Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule

BY MAHATMA GANDHI

"It is certainly my good fortune that this booklet is receiving wide attention. It is a book which can be put into the hands of a child."—*Mahatma Gandhi*.

4th Edn. As. 8. To Subs. of the "I. R.", As. 6.

Foreign 9d. Postage 3d.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

Congress Presidential Addresses

(IN TWO VOLS.)

In response to a great demand for a complete collection of Congress Presidential Addresses, the Publishers have issued these two Volumes containing full text of the Addresses of all the Presidents of the Congress, from 1885 down to 1934.

First Series from 1885 to 1910

From the Foundation to the Silver Jubilee

Rs. 4. To Subscribers of the "I. R.", Rs. 3-8.

Foreign 6sh. Postage 1sh. 6d.

Second Series from 1911 to 1934

From the Silver to the Golden Jubilee

Rs. 4. To Subscribers of the "I. R." Rs. 3-8.

Foreign 6sh. Postage 1sh. 6d.

SELECT OPINIONS

The Hindusthan Review :—"A perusal of the speeches serves to give a connected political history of the times and reveal the increasing complexities of the political problems.

The Official History of the Congress :—"The gratitude of the Public is due to this enterprising and patriotic firm—forerunners in the field of national literature—for this act of additional service to Indian Nationalism done in the "Jubilee" year of the Congress."

Crown 8vo. Nearly 1000 Pp. Indexed, Cloth Bound.

Price Rs. 4 each volume.

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review", Rs. 3-8 each.
Foreign 6sh. each volume. Postage 1sh. 6d. each.

A Set costs Rs. 8. Foreign 12sh.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

Sir Jagadish Chunder Bose

HIS LIFE, DISCOVERIES AND WRITINGS

Carefully selected and arranged under three headings: Educational, General, and Science.

Dr. Ray's Essays and Discourses

A comprehensive and authoritative collection of the Essays and Discourses of Dr. P. C. Ray.

Besant's Speeches and Writings

A comprehensive collection of Mrs. Besant's speeches and writings on Indian Questions.

Wedderburn's Speeches & Writings

A comprehensive and exhaustive collection of Sir William Wedderburn's Speeches and Writings on Indian questions, his Congress Presidential Addresses, and his speeches in the House of Commons.

Wacha's Speeches and Writings

Writings on a variety of subjects—political, educational, industrial, commercial, and financial.

Lord Sinha's Speeches & Writings

Book Post, London :—" Every page reveals a man who is neither extremist nor reactionary ; a man filled with an unquenchable ardour for the betterment of his people. Cloth Bound and Indexed.

Raja Ram Mohun Roy's Speeches

This is the first attempt to collect under one cover the voluminous writings of Raja Ram Mohun Roy.

Rs. 3. each. To Subs. of " I.R." Rs. 2-8 each.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

Natesan's National Biographies

Indian Christians

CONTENTS :—K. M. Banerji, Lal Behari Dey, Ramachandra, M. M. Datta, Rev. Sathianadhan, Dr. Imad-ud-din, Nehemiah Goreh, K. C. Banerjee, Ramabhai, Rajah Harnam Singh, L. D. Swamikannu Pillai, N. V. Tilak, S. K. Rudra and Sadhu Sundar Singh. *With thirteen illustrations.*

Famous Parsis

CONTENTS :—Jeejeebhoy, Banaji, Naoroji Feroozji, Byramji Jeejeebhoy, Sir Dinshaw Petit, S. S. Bengalee, Dadabhai Naoroji, K. R. Cama, J. N. Tata, Sir D. E. Wacha, Sir P. M. Mehta, Sir M. M. Bhowmaggree, Malabari and Sir J. J. Modi.

Indian Scientists

CONTENTS :—Dr. Mahendralal Sircar ; Sir Jagadish C. Bose ; Sir Prafulla Chandra Ray ; Dr. Sir C. V. Raman ; Prof. Ramachandra ; Srinivasa Ramanujam.

Indian Judges

CONTENTS :—Sir T. Muthuswamy Aiyar, Nanabhai Haridas, Dwarkanath Mitter, Mahadev Govind Ranade, Sir S. Subramanya Aiyar, Sir V. Bashyam Iyengar, Badruddin Tyabji, Sir Gurudas Bannerjee, Sir P. C. Bannerjee, Sarada Charan Mitra, Sir Syed Amir Ali, Kashinath Trimbak Telang, Justice Mahmood, Sir Romesh Chander Mitter, Sir N. Chandavarkar, Sir C. Sankaran Nair, Sir Asutosh Mukerjee, V. Krishnaswami Aiyar, Justice Shah Din, Sir Shadi Lal and Sir Abdur Rahim.

Indian Statesmen

Biographical sketches of 17 famous Dewans and Prime Ministers of Indian States.

Eminent Mussulmans

Biographical sketches of 24 Muslim Statesmen, Poets, Politicians, Statesmen, Reformers, etc.

Rs. 3. each. To Subs. of "I.R.", Rs. 2-8 each.

Foreign 4sh. 6d. Postage 1sh. 6d.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

BOOKS ON INDIA

Congress Presidential Addresses. (In 2 Vols.)
Containing full text of Presidential Addresses from
1885 to 1934. First volume from the Foundation to
the Silver Jubilee (1885 to 1910). Second volume from
the Silver to the Golden Jubilee (1911 to 1934).
Rs. 4 each. To Subs. of "I.R." Rs. 3-8 each.

Indians Overseas. This is a first systematic study
of the manifold problems faced by the 27 lakhs of
Indians in different parts of the world. By Dr. Lanka
Sundaram, M.A. Re. 1-8. To Subs. "I.R." Re. 1-4.

Indian National Evolution. A brief Survey of
the origin and progress of the Indian National
Congress and the growth of Indian Nationalism.
By A. C. Mazumdar. Rs. 3. To Subs. "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

Mahatma Gandhi: The Man and his Mission.
Re. 1. To Subs. of the "I.R." As. 12.

Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule. By
Gandhi. 4th Edn. As. 8. To Subs. "I.R." As. 6.

Freedom and Culture. By Sir S. Radhakrishnan.
Re. 1. To Subs. of "I.R." As. 12.

The Heart of Hindusthan. By Sir S. Radha-
krishnan. 3rd Edn. Re. 1. To Subs. "I.R." As. 12.

Malabar and its Folk. By Mr. T. K. Gopala
Panikkar, B.A. Rs. 2. To Subs. of "I.R." Re. 1-8.

Leaders of the Brahmo Samaj. 7 Portraits and
Sketches. Re. 1-8. To Subs. "I.R." Re. 1-4.

On Khaddar. By Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya.
Price As. 8. To Subs. of "Indian Review." As. 6.

Essays on Indian Economics. By Mahadev
Govind Ranade. Rs. 2. To Subs. of "I.R." Re. 1-8.

Indian Tales of Fun, Folly and Folklore. This is
a collection in one volume of 120 Tales. Re. 1-4.
To Subs. of the "Indian Review", Re. 1.

Tales from the Sanskrit Dramatists. Second and
Revised Edition. Rs. 2. To Subs. "I.R." Re. 1-8.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

Tales from the Sanskrit Dramatists

THE FAMOUS PLAYS OF

KALIDASA, BHASA, HARSHA, SUDRAKA,

BHAVABHUTI AND VISAKHADATTA.

CONTENTS: Vision of Vasavadatta, Avimaraka, Sakuntala, Malavikagnimitra, Vikramorvasiya, Mricchakatika, Malati-Madhava, Uttara-Ramacharita, Nagananda, Ratnavali and Mudrarakshasa.

Second Edition. Revised and enlarged.

Rs. 2. To Subs. of "Indian Review", Re. 1-8.

Foreign 3sh. Postage 9d.

INDIAN TALES

OF FUN, FOLLY AND FOLK-LORE

A COLLECTION OF THE

Tales of Tenali Raman; Tales of Mariada Raman; Tales of Raja Birbal; Komati Wit and Wisdom, The Son-in-Law Abroad; New Indian Tales; Tales of Raya and Appaji: Folklore of the Telugus.

Price Re. 1-4.

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review", Re. One.

THE IDIOT'S WIFE

A STIRRING STORY OF SOCIAL LIFE IN BENGAL

BY

DR. NARESH CHUNDER SEN GUPTA, M.A., D.L.

The heroine is one of the most notable creations in modern Indian literature. A stirring tale.

As. 8. To Subs. of the "Indian Review", As. 6.

MALABAR AND ITS FOLK

A SYSTEMATIC DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIAL CUSTOMS
AND INSTITUTIONS OF MALABAR

By T. K. GOPAL PANIKKAR, B.A.

Price Rs. 2. To Subs. of the "I.R.", Re. 1-8.

Foreign orders must be accompanied with remittance.

Books will not be sent by C. O. D. System.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PUBLISHERS, MADRAS.

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय
Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Library

मसूरी

MUSSOORIE

104829

यह पुरस्कार निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।

This book is to be returned on the date last stamped.

[illegible]

104829

अवाप्ति मंख्या

Acc No. ~~4983~~

वर्ग संख्या

पुस्तक संख्या

Class No. _____

Book No. _____

लेखक

Author _____

शीर्षक

324.2

Con

LIBRARY

Ser. 1

LAL BHADUR SHASTRI

National Academy of Administration

MUSSOORIE

Accession No. _____

104829

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.

Help to keep this book fresh, clean & moving